DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 738 AA 001 033

TITLE	Annual Evaluation Report on Education Programs, FY 1971.
INSTITUTION	Office of Program Planning and Evaluation (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jan 72
NOTE	300p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Annual Reports; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Programs; Educational Research; Educational Technology; Elementary Education; Equal Education; *Evaluation Methods; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Handicapped Students; Higher Education; Information Dissemination; Libraries; National Programs; Professional Training; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Relevance (Education); Secondary Education; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Office of Education

ABSTRACT

A comprehensive report on the approximately 100 Office of Education programs is provided in this evaluation of the programs for FY 1971. The status of the evaluation function itself is briefly discussed; a general overview is made of the effectiveness of the Office of Education programs; and short evaluation reports are provided for each of the educational programs and legislative titles. These reports appear under the following categories of programs: Elementary and Secondary Education, Education for the Handicapped, Vocational and Adult Education, Higher Education, Education Professions Development, Libraries and Educational Technology, Educational Research and Development, Educational Dissemination, and National Priority Programs. Each program evaluation report is presented in the same format, as follows: Program Name, Legislation, Expiration Date, Funding History, Program Purpose and Operation, Program Effectiveness, Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies, and Sources of Evaluation Data. The three principal thrusts of the Office of Education programs are seen as being (1) equalizing educational opportunity, (2) improving the quality and relevance of American education, and (3) providing limited general support to selected educational functions and activities. (DB)

ED065738

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PPE AA

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

FY 1971

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education
Office of Program Planning and Evaluation

January 1972

AA001033

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS: FY 1971

Table of Contents

Page

I. General

A. The Status of Educational Evaluation 1
B. A General Overview of the Effectiveness of OE Programs . . .4

II. Detailed Descriptions and Effectiveness Information

A. Elementary and Secondary Education 22

1. Education of Disadvantaged Children. 23
2. Supplementary Educational Centers and Services 31
3. Strengthening State Departments of Education 38
4. Bilingual Education 40
5. Dropout Prevention 43
6. Financial Assistance for Strengthening Instruction in Science, Mathematics, Modern Foreign Languages and Other Critical Subjects. 46
7. Follow Through 50
8. School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: Maintenance and Operation. 53
9. School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: Construction. .57
10. Emergency School Assistance 63

B. Education for the Handicapped 71

1. State Grant Program 72
2. Regional Resource Centers. 74
3. Deaf/Blind Centers. 76
4. Early Childhood Education 78
5. Teacher Education 80
6. Recruitment and Information 83
7. Physical Education and Recreation-Training. 85
8. Research, Innovation and Demonstration. 87
9. Physical Education and Recreation-Research. 89
10. Media Services and Captioned Films. 91
11. Specific Learning Disabilities. 94

C. Vocational and Adult Education 96

1. Vocational and Technical Education: Basic Grants to States 97

Page

C. Vocational and Adult Education 96

2. Vocational and Technical Education: Programs for Students with Special Needs. 107
3. Vocational and Technical Education: Research and Training 110
4. Vocational and Technical Education: Exemplary Programs. 114
5. Vocational and Technical Education: Consumer and Homemaking Education 118
6. Vocational and Technical Education: Cooperative Education Programs 121
7. Vocational and Technical Education: Work Study Programs. 125
8. Vocational and Technical Education: Curriculum Development 128
9. Adult Basic Education: Basic Grants to States 131
10. Adult Basic Education: Special Projects 134
11. Adult Basic Education: Teacher Training 137
12. Manpower Development and Training Programs 140

D. Higher Education 146

1. Educational Opportunity Grants Program 147
2. College Work-Study Program 150
3. Cooperative Education Program. 153
4. Guaranteed Student Loan Program. 155
5. National Defense Student Loan Program. 158
6. Upward Bound Program 162
7. Educational Talent Search Program. 166
8. Special Services for Disadvantaged Students. 168
9. Strengthening Developing Institutions. 170
10. Annual Interest Grants 172
11. Grants for Construction of Undergraduate Academic Facilities 174
12. State Administration and Planning. 176
13. Foreign Language and Areas Centers, Rsearch and Studies. 178
14. Fulbright-Hays Act 181
15. Community Service and Continuing Education Program . . . 183
16. Land Grant Colleges and Universities 186
17. NDEA Fellowship Programs 188
18. EPDA, Part E Fellowships 194
19. EPDA, Part E Institutes 197

E. Education Professions Development. 200

1. Attracting Qualified Persons to the Field of Education . 201

Page

E. Education Professions Development 200

2. Teacher Corps Program 203
3. State Grant Program for Attracting and Qualifying Teachers. 206
4. Educational Leadership Program. 208
5. Career Opportunities Program. 210
6. Early Childhood Program 214
7. School Personnel Utilization Program. 216
8. Special Education Program 219
9. Training of Teacher Trainers Program. 222
10. Pupil Personnel Services Program. 224
11. Urban/Rural School Development Program. 226
12. Teacher Development for Desegregating Schools Program . 228
13. Vocational Education Personnel Program. 231

F. Libraries and Educational Technology. 234

1. Library Services. 235
2. Public Library Construction 239
3. Interlibrary Cooperative Services 241
4. Academic Library Resources. 243
5. Career Training - Libraries 245
6. Educational Technology and Library Demonstrations . . . 247
7. Educational Broadcasting Facilities 249
8. Sesame Street. 251
9. Undergraduate Instructional Equipment 253
10. Media Specialist Program. 255
11. School Library Resources. 257

G. Educational Research and Development. 260

1. Basic Research Program, Including Regional Research . . 261
2. Applied Research and Development Program. 264
3. Educational Laboratory and R&D Center Program 267
4. Research Training Program 271
5. Experimental Schools Program. 274

H. Educational Dissemination 276

1. Spread of Exemplary Practices 277
2. Strengthening State and Local Dissemination Capabilities 279
3. Educational Resources Information Centers 281
4. Interpretive Summaries. 283
5. General Program Dissemination: Office of Public Affairs 285

Page

I. National Priority Programs 287

1. Right-to-Read. 288
2. Drug Abuse Education 291
3. Environmental Education. 293
4. Nutrition and Health 295

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS: FY 1971

A. The Status of Educational Evaluation

Section 404 of the General Educational Provisions Act requires that a report "evaluating the results and effectiveness of programs and projects assisted" be submitted annually to the appropriate committees of the Congress. In the four years since the Congress legislated this requirement, individual reports on several of the major education programs have been submitted (on Titles I and III of the ESEA, for example), but this is the first time an effort has been made to provide a comprehensive report on all Office of Education programs.

This first effort is just that. It falls far short of providing, for the approximately 100 OE programs or legislative titles, the kind of rigorous, objective, quantitative, evaluation data which both the executive and legislative branches should have if good funding and management decisions are to be made about these programs. A systematic program for designing and carrying out the kinds of studies which will provide this needed evaluation data has been initiated, but the results are only now beginning to come in. As for the present lack of evaluation results, we must simply note that systematic efforts at evaluating education programs have had only a brief history. In FY 1968 and 1969, for example, only $1.25 million was appropriated for evaluating over $4 billion in Office of Education programs; and in prior years even smaller token amounts were available.[1]

---

[1] This figure does not include the funds allocated in Title I, ESEA for State and local administration and evaluation which has been largely used for administrative rather than evaluative purposes. The evaluations which have been carried out by states and localities with these funds, as reflected in the required annual report from the States on Title I, have been disappointing and have not provided a sound or useful basis for assessing the overall effectiveness of this program. It also does not include the significant portion of the Follow Through budget which is used for evaluation purposes in that experimental program.

It was not until FY 1970 that significant amounts were appropriated specifically for planning and evaluating education programs. In FY 70, $9.5 million was appropriated for these purposes, but the appropriation was not passed until close to the end of the fiscal year (March 1970), and the hurried effort to assemble qualified staff and develop useful evaluation projects during the final three months of the fiscal year understandably left something to be desired. (See Table 1.)

Thus, only eighteen months have elapsed since the first large group of evaluation study contracts from the FY 70 appropriation were awarded. Since then, steps have been taken to develop a strong evaluation capability in the Office of Education: the evaluation function has been centralized; the technical competence of the staff has been improved; some 75 major evaluation studies have been designed and initiated; and a process for disseminating the results of evaluation studies to the Congress and other Agencies in the Executive Branch has been developed.*

This report, then, begins the annual submission of comprehensive reports on the effectiveness of educational programs, even though this initial effort must acknowledge that at the present time there are as many gaps in our evaluation knowledge as there are cases where we have good evidence on program effectiveness. We hope that the major evaluation effort we have undertaken will rapidly close these gaps.

In this first submission we provide not only (1) this brief report on the status of the evaluation function itself, but (2) an overview statement on what the available evidence seems to indicate about the effectiveness of the major education programs and expenditures, and (3) a collection of short evaluation reports on each of the educational programs and legislative titles.

---

*The Commissioner now sends summaries or full reports from completed evaluation studies directly to all members of the several education committees in both Houses of Congress, as well as to other appropriate Executive Branch agencies.

TABLE 1

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND EVALUATION APPROPRIATIONS, FY 68-72

FY 1968	$ 1,250,000
FY 1969	1,250,000
FY 1970	9,512,000
FY 1971	11,575,000
FY 1972	11,325,000

Does not include $5 million appropriated for grants to States for planning and evaluation under ESEA, Title V, nor does it include funds authorized for evaluation from Follow Through and the Emergency School Assistance Program, or program funds spent by state or local education agencies on evaluations of ESEA Titles I, III, VII, VIII.

B. A General Overview of the Effectiveness of OE Programs

Recognizing that we do not yet have extensive evidence on the effectiveness of all Federal education programs, what can be said on the basis of limited data about how well these programs are achieving their principal objectives? As we attempt to answer this question, we should note by way of background that American education at all levels has traditionally been an almost totally local enterprise, with the funding for public schools coming largely from local taxes and the determination of educational policies and the administration of the schools being almost entirely under local authority. While the proportion of State financing of public schools has increased somewhat over recent years, the traditional role of the States has been mainly to enact and implement legal minimums for expenditures, teacher qualifications, curricular offerings, and student attendance. The Federal contribution in turn has been even smaller. The Office of Education presently contributes about 7%, and the Federal government as a whole about 12%, of the total national expenditures for education. It contributes 20% of the total for higher education. Taken all together the approximately 100 education programs and legislative titles which comprise this limited Federal role have been concerned with three basic objectives:

- To equalize educational opportunity among groups who are at a disadvantage educationally by reason of economic, racial, or physical and mental handicapping conditions.
- To improve the quality and relevance of American education, primarily through research, experimentation, demonstration, dissemination and training activities.

- To provide limited general support to selected educational functions and activities (such as libraries, developing post-secondary institutions, equipment and construction, etc.)

In this section, using available data and experience, we attempt to make a general assessment of how well these three major objectives are being furthered through the variety of programs which are devoted to them.

1. Equalizing Educational Opportunity

Few would disagree with the assertion that the need to equalize educational opportunity and to compensate for the educational deficits of the disadvantaged remains the major educational problem in American society. Approximately 65% of the current $5 billion OE budget is devoted to programs primarily concerned with this problem. The single largest program in this area is Title I of ESEA which is presently funded at the level of $1.6 billion annually.

The best assessment which can be made of Title I since its enactment in 1965 is that it is a mixture of very important achievements and unfulfilled promise. The mere passage of Title I legislation has put the Congress and the Federal government on record with a major commitment to redress the educational deficits which result from a childhood in poverty. It has sensitized State and local educational authorities to the importance of this problem and to the need to devote their funds and attention to its solution. The Title I funds themselves, after an early period of unproductively diffuse application -- and in some cases outright misuse -- are now better targeted on the neediest schools and pupils.

As for the effects which Title I funds and programs have had in improving educational achievement, the evidence is incomplete and less reassuring. We can only speculate as to what the effects would be on the current achievement levels of disadvantaged children if the Title I funds were removed, but while some states and localities report success, there is little solid evidence to indicate that the mere presence of these funds and programs has led to widespread and significant increases in achievement scores. Many economically disadvantaged children continue to arrive at school with a lower level of readiness and performance than their middle class peers, and to fall progressively further behind them through the elementary and secondary grades. The lack of evidence of dramatic achievement gains among disadvantaged children in most Title I programs is paralleled by similar disappointments with other compensatory education programs. We must simply acknowledge that the task of remediating the educational deficits of disadvantaged children is far more complex and stubborn than most had imagined; and it is clear that one of the major remaining tasks in educational R&D is to develop effective compensatory programs that can significantly redress these deficits.

Developing such model programs is one of the main purposes of the Follow Through program. Moreover, some progress along these lines is contained in a recently completed OE evaluation of individual compensatory program techniques and models funded from a variety of sources. This study examined 3,000 such programs and found 41 on which there was solid evidence of significant cognitive gains among disadvantaged children.

Another major area in which there has been a Federal effort to equalize educational opportunity is that of education of the handicapped. The sum total of the programs in this area is not large ($260 million in FY 72) and the strategy here -- again reflecting the concept of a limited Federal leadership role rather than an attempt to serve the entire target population -- has been to provide seed money and to support various demonstration efforts as a catalyst to increase State, local and private contributions toward a much needed expansion of handicapped programs. Our estimates are that at the present time only 40% of physically and mentally handicapped children are receiving minimally adequate educational programs. The evidence we have indicates that our handicapped strategy has been a largely successful one and has had a multiplier effect as noted by increased numbers of children served, the integration of new programs into the general pattern of special education services, and the introduction of innovative techniques to improve instruction. The Federal contributions seem to have been most visible in the research and teacher training areas. Federal support in these areas has helped develop a research cadre among special educators and to support development of teacher training programs in over 300 colleges and universities. However, the increased efforts that have been underway for some time to assist in the improvement in the quality of State and local services to the handicapped should soon be identifiable. Current ongoing evaluation activities should show whether or not Federal objectives are being achieved.

The need to equalize educational opportunity for members of racial minorities continues to be one of our greatest educational problems. With the exception of the Civil Rights Legislation, some set-asides for Indians and Migrants in ESEA Title I, the relatively small Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP) which is intended to provide funds to assist schools carrying out desegregation plans, and the Bilingual education program, the Office of Education does not have major programs identified exclusively for Blacks, Mexican-Americans Puerto Ricans, Indians, or other racial minorities. However, the overlap between those who are economically disadvantaged as well as members of racial minorities is so great that most of the programs aimed at the economically disadvantaged also serve directly large portions of racial minorities. Also, administration policy in areas such as the Developing Institutions program is to target a major portion of the available funds to Black colleges. The appropriations for the first two years of the ESAP program were not large ($75 million for FY 71 and the same amount for FY 72). However, the Emergency School Aid Act now before the Congress would provide $1.5 billion over a two year period. The initial demand for these funds throughout the South resulted in individually small grants, and the impact of these first small grants on the desegregation process appears to have been helpful but not dramatic. Evaluation findings on the program to date indicate that some of the ESAP activities showed positive effects. These activities include counseling, counseling support, student activities and remedial programs. Teacher training activities appeared to have little impact on teacher interaction with students of another race in the classroom.

In higher education a variety of programs have focused on equalizing access to higher education for the economically disadvantaged. For example, student loans and grants assisted two million students from low income families to attend colleges and universities in FY 71. It is estimated that one million of these students would have been unable to attend without Federal assistance. A trio of programs -- Talent Search, Upward Bound, and Special Services -- have systematically sought out capable disadvantaged youngsters, provided encouragement and supportive services for them to attend college, and continued to provide additional support and assistance after they were admitted. The evidence indicates that the Upward Bound program in particular has been successful in getting talented children from low income families to complete high school, enter college, and remain there at rates significantly above what would have been the case without the program.[1]

The developing institutions program ($33.9 million in FY 71) is providing assistance to roughly 500 developing institutions in the U.S. in helping them strengthen their academic, administrative, and student services programs so that they can become financially self-sustaining and offer higher quality education to their students. Sixty percent of the funds are going to approximately 100 black institutions.

In sum, the largest thrust of the limited Federal role in American education has been the attempt to redress various inequalities of educational opportunity. None of these programs, individually or the

---

1. See the Upward Bound evaluation summary in Section III.

total group collectively, has yet succeeded in reaching all of their target populations, achieving all their objectives, or fully compensating for the educational deficits that result from being economically disadvantaged or physically or mentally handicapped. Nevertheless, the partial evidence we have in hand does seem to indicate that while new and effective program techniques need to be devised, coverage needs to be expanded, and management improvements are needed all along the line, these programs, taken as a whole, seem to have made a significant contribution to the goal of equalizing educational opportunity for all American citizens.

In addition to the traditional sources of unequal educational opportunity which Federal education programs have been addressing -- those deriving from economic, racial, physical and mental handicap conditions -- there has now emerged a new one which may well come to preoccupy as much of our concern and require as much fiscal and programmatic attention as these more traditional sources of inequality. This is the widespread inequity in educational finance. Recent court decisions in California, Minnesota, and Texas have all found that the basic system for financing elementary and secondary education which obtains in virtually all States and localities is unconstitutional because it discriminates on the basis of wealth by providing children who are born and grow up in a wealthy school district a better education than those who live in a poor district where limited resources result in much lower per pupil expenditures. If these court decisions are upheld for all States, massive reform of our present educational finance system will be required, and the traditional roles of local, State and Federal governments in the support of education will have to be completely re-evaluated.

2. Improving the Quality and Relevance of American Education

Improving the quality and relevance of American education is partly related to the goal of equalizing educational opportunity since better educational processes and techniques are required to improve the educational achievement of the disadvantaged. But the larger goal is to update and improve the educational system at all levels for all students. Approximately 15% of the OE budget is allocated to this goal. Most of this is in the form of project grants as contrasted to formula grant funds.

The research, experimentation, development, dissemination and training programs have provided the principal means for pursuing this goal. Although some notable successes were achieved by the educational research laboratories and centers and by project grants for basic and applied research (such as development of Individually Prescribed Instruction, the Multi-Level School, Computer Assisted Instruction, the Communication Skills Program, Sesame Street, the National Assessment Programs, new curricula in physics and English, and the Educational Resource Information Centers), there has been a general dissatisfaction with the impact of the R&D program. A number of reviews criticized the lack of significant breakthroughs, the diffuse and non-targeted nature of the project grant research, the non-productivity of some of the labs and centers, the inability to translate research into operational practice, and the difficulties in appraising and disseminating research findings and products. The substance of these criticisms has been acknowledged, but in fairness to the researchers, we should not lose sight of the fact that while the problems have been huge, the amount of funds allocated to educational research and development has been a shockingly small percentage of total national educational expenditures -- approximately one-tenth of one percent. It is only two percent of the OE budget.

The other principal programs which comprise OE's developmental and reform effort are reviewed briefly below:

> The Experimental Schools program ($15 million in FY 72), now finishing its second year of operation, tests comprehensive alternatives to present educational practices, procedures and performance in operational settings. It is too soon to assess its effectiveness, but a major evaluation is underway as an integral part of the program.
>
> Sesame Street is a highly successful educational TV program which imparts basic reading and arithmetic readiness skills to pre-school children. Evaluation study results show that approximately 8 million 3 to 6 year-olds have benefitted from this program, particularly children from low-income areas who have had access to television. The study indicated that 3, 4 and 5 year-old children from a variety of backgrounds acquired important complex as well as simple cognitive skills as a result of watching the program. Those who watched the most gained the most. This program is now being followed by the Electric Company, a remedial reading program for 7-10 year-olds using Sesame Street techniques.

Follow Through is a mixed experimental and service program developing and testing compensatory methods which can reinforce, from kindergarten through grade three, gains that disadvantaged children may have achieved in Headstart or similar preschool programs. Eighteen different models are being tested and the results from a major evaluation will be available by Fall, 1972. It is intended that successful Follow Through results will be used to influence ESEA, Title I.

The Bilingual Program is a demonstration program designed to meet the special education needs of children who come from environments where the dominant language is other than English. The program is aimed at the teaching of English while maintaining the home language and culture, and fostering legitimate pride in both languages. Quantitative evidence on the success of this program is not available but there is anecdotal evidence that suggests that the program may be effective in achieving competency in both English and the home language. A national evaluation of this program will be conducted in FY 72.

The Dropout Prevention Program is a demonstration program aimed at reducing the number of high school students leaving school before graduation. Evidence to date indicates that the program is well focused on its target population and that most of the ten projects funded were effective in reducing the dropout rate.

The Right to Read program is designed to substantially reduce functional illiteracy in the U.S. Through the demonstration of effective reading programs and the provision of technical assistance, the Right to Read program is aimed at helping locally operated reading programs to become effective regardless of the level of instruction or the age of the participant. The first sites were identified in January 1972 and thus, the program is too new to assess its impact.

The Dissemination program is undergoing a substantial expansion. In the past, the program provided mainly a library of educational materials of research and development products for use by researchers, practitioners and the interested public. This is the Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC) system. Although the ERIC system has grown steadily, the program is now being restructured to play a far more aggressive and active role with the goal of accelerating the adoption of innovative practices and products. The new program has several components. These include: State Dissemination Centers for general dissemination of information about tested and useful research products; Product Management Teams to assist school systems to adopt and install products; Education Extension Agents operating at the State and local level to assist educational decisionmakers to identify and adopt proven research products; and the Educational Renewal Sites which will provide a key mechanism for disseminating information to school personnel about promising innovations.

Teacher Training Programs - any reform strategy must involve improvements in the way that teachers are trained. Up until 1970 most of the effort of the teacher training institutions was aimed at reducing the teacher shortages that had existed for two decades. In 1970 the supply caught up with the demand and since then there has been a teacher surplus which is projected to continue until 1980. The surplus has enabled Federal, State and local agencies to focus on improving teacher selection and quality.

It is obvious that any real improvement in the educational systems must involve improvements in the preparation of teachers and in the quality of their teaching. This is not a new Federal goal. For example, the establishment of the Teacher Corps in 1965 was aimed at encouraging colleges and universities to modify and broaden their programs of teacher preparation and to attract dedicated and capable young people to teach the disadvantaged who would not otherwise consider a teaching career. A recent evaluation study indicated that the program has been reasonably successful in attracting and retaining capable young people in teaching careers and in changing teacher preparation methods in some participating colleges and universities.

The Career Opportunities Program (COP) also has as one of its chief aims the improvement of teacher quality through attracting low-income persons to new careers in schools serving low-income families. COP trainees serve as education aides and can move up the career ladder and receive training leading to full certification. The program is new and no formal assessment has been made. Preliminary studies indicate that it is meeting its objectives in terms of attracting as trainees low income participants who are residents of the communities where they are serving, encouraging over 7000 schools to hire COP trainees as auxiliary teachers, giving employment to over 800 veterans, and showing that low-income people can participate at the college level successfully and perform successfully in the classroom.

A variety of other programs including the Attracting Qualified Persons to the Field of Education Program (Part A, Section 504, EPDA), the Educational Leadership Program (Part D, Section 531, EPDA), the School Personnel Utilization Program (Part D, Section 531, EPDA) the Training of Teacher Trainers Program (Part D, Section 531, EPDA), and the Teacher Development for Desegregating Schools Program (Part D, Section 531 EPDA) are all aimed at improving the selection, training and retraining of teachers. The success of the individual programs has been mixed, but collectively they represent the many alternatives to improvement in teaching quality.

In higher education, the National Defense Education Act Fellowships have had a substantial impact on the increased supply of qualified college instructors in disciplines ranging from the hard sciences to the humanities. Funds for the training of post-secondary educational personnel under the Education Professions Development Act are targeted on developing institutions and community colleges.

> Preliminary evidence indicates that the personnel benefitting from the program have entered the targeted institutions.

The assessments we have made of these programs have resulted in the decision to make fundamental changes in our research and development strategy. First is the proposal, now being considered by the Congress, for the establishment of the National Institute of Education to improve the quality and relevance of educational research and development. Second is the proposed establishment of a National Foundation for Post Secondary Education to help colleges and universities develop innovations in their structure and curricula. Thus, the NIE is designed to overcome traditional weaknesses in the research and development program while the NFPSC would fill a critical gap in providing seed money for reforms in post-secondary education. Both agencies would also seek to develop alternatives to traditional schooling. These proposals would transfer most of the current educational research and development activity to new agencies which would be better organized, staffed and funded to carry on these activities.

Other changes involve a basic restructuring and redirection of those reform and renewal activities that will remain with the Office of Education if and when the establishment of the NIE and NFPSC occurs -- such activities as implementation, demonstration and installation of research products and related training of educational personnel. Dissemination activities will be performed in conjunction with NIE. In this restructuring most of the project grant programs of the Office of Education are being brought together under the Deputy Commissioner for Development so that these efforts can be better integrated and targeted on resolving educational problems. These include existing programs such as Bilingual Education, Dropout Prevention, Teacher Corps, Education Professions Development, Follow Through, Drug Abuse Education, Right to Read and Environmental Education. They also include new or drastically reorganized activities such as Educational Renewal Sites, Dissemination, Exemplary Career Education Models and Educational Technology. In regard to these latter:

Educational Renewal Sites are being established in local school districts to provide developmental and technical assistance to school systems and school personnel in effecting educational improvement and reform. Initially a limited number of local sites will be established to assess local school needs, determine priorities, develop local programs integrating appropriate Federal funds, train and retrain teachers in new skills and methods areas and adopt new proven improvements and reforms.

The expanded Dissemination program has been discussed above.

The Career Education program, also a central component of the renewal effort, is discussed below.

The technology program is being given new direction and emphasis. It is clear that inadequate use has been made of technology in many of our educational systems, and there is a need to capitalize on technological developments to improve both teaching and learning. Thus we are supporting demonstrations of applications of technology as alternatives to conventional instructional systems.

These alternatives include satellite operations, cable TV, instructional programming and other telecommunication applications focused on improving delivery systems.

3. Selected General Support

The Office of Education administers a number of programs that provide general support to schools. These include impact aid, construction and equipment programs, basic grants to States for vocational and adult education, aid to land-grant colleges, public library programs and the purchase of school and college library materials. About 20% of the OE budget is allocated to these programs. In view of the limited Federal role in supporting operational activities and higher educational priorities, the Federal policy has been to hold the line on these programs or retarget them for specific purposes.

Since these are general support programs, it is difficult to assess their effectiveness except in terms of providing Federal funds to help schools and universities meet operational requirements in the areas mentioned. In general, this purpose has been achieved. The construction programs have helped meet the facilities needs of colleges and universities although they have not been able to meet some of the needs of the black colleges. The equipment programs have enabled school systems, colleges and libraries to purchase needed books and instructional equipment, but there is some case study evidence of supplies and equipment purchased and not being effectively used. We have recommended that the equipment programs be phased down.

The various library programs also seem to be helping the libraries meet their operational needs in serving the general population. However, impact data about the effectiveness of library programs in meeting the needs of various target groups such as the disadvantaged has not been collected. Studies are in process to provide this information.

Impact data on the State grant programs is lacking, but there is evidence that the Federal programs provide a substantial portion of the funds for these programs and some would probably be reduced in scope or curtailed without the Federal support.

The Impact Aid Program ($550 million in FY 71), provides local school districts with funds to compensate for the absence of tax revenues in Federally impacted areas. The program has served this general purpose, but a major evaluation study indicated that the distribution formula now in use often results in large sums of funds going to already wealthy school districts. Both the present and previous administrations have made recommendations to the Congress that the formula be modified so as to provide more equitable compensation for revenue losses due to the presence of Federal installations. The Impact Aid Program can also be considered as serving to help equalize educational opportunity.

The Vocational Education Basic Grant to States program is a formula grant program with the objective of assuring that education and training programs for career vocations are available to all individuals who desire and need such training for employment. There is a 15% set-aside for the disadvantaged and a 10% set-aside for the handicapped. Although national effectiveness data is not available, traditional vocational education apparently suffers from a negative image and has not attracted first-rate students. There is also some question whether vocational programs are attuned to local as well as national manpower needs. As a result of assessments of this program, in conjunction with the clear need to reform the basic thrust of secondary education to provide a more relevant educational experience, vocational education programs are being redirected and incorporated within the larger development of career education as a major reform thrust. The Career Education program has been designed, therefore, to prepare students for a successful life of work by improving the basis for occupational choice, facilitating the acquisition of job skills and enhancing educational achievement by making education more meaningful and relevant to the aspirations and expectations of students. Although aimed at all educational levels, the program is intended to reform the secondary school curriculum and also overcome the poor image now attributed to traditional vocational education programs. Much of the current effort is focusing on the development of four career education models; school based, employer based, home/community based and residential institution based.

Conclusion

These then constitute summary assessments of the programs that support the three principal thrusts of the Office of Education, equalizing educational opportunity, improving the quality and relevance of American education and providing limited general support to selected educational functions and activities. The next section contains more detailed descriptions and effectiveness information about each of the programs.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS AND EFFECTIVENESS INFORMATION

A. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Page

1. Education of Disadvantaged Children 23
2. Supplementary Educational Centers and Services 31
3. Strengthening State Departments of Education 38
4. Bilingual Education 40
5. Dropout Prevention 43
6. Financial Assistance for Strengthening Instruction in Science, Mathematics, Modern Foreign Languages and Other Critical Subjects . . 46
7. Follow Through 50
8. School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: Maintenance and Operation 53
9. School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: Construction 57
10. Emergency School Assistance 63

January 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Education of Disadvantaged Children

Legislation:

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Expiration Date:

6/30/73

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$1,192,581,000	$1,192,581,000
1967	1,430,764,000	1,053,470,000
1968	1,902,136,000	1,191,000,000
1969	2,184,436,000	1,123,127,000
1970	2,359,554,000	1,339,051,000
1971	3,457,406,000	1,500,000,000
1972	3,642,089,000	1,597,500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Section 101 of P.L. 89-10, as amended through 90th Congress, 1st session states:

> In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local education agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in this part) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

Administrative responsibilities for Title I are shared by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, State education agencies (SEAs), and local education agencies (LEAs). USOE (1) determines the entitlements of counties and of State education agencies, (2) approves State applications for Title I funds, (3) makes funds available to approved SEAs, (4) develops and disseminates regulations, guidelines, and other materials related to administration of Title I, (5) provides technical assistance to SEAs (6) compiles fiscal, statistical, and evaluation data, and (7) evaluates the results and effectiveness of the program.

Participating SEAs must assure USOE that they will administer the program in their States and submit evaluation and fiscal reports as provided in the law and regulations. Administrative functions of SEAs include (1) approval or disapproval of proposed LEA projects, (2) suballocation of county fund entitlement to grant funds to eligible and participating LEAs, (3) provision of technical assistance to LEAs, (4) maintenance of fiscal records, and (5) preparation of fiscal and evaluation reports for USOE.

In developing, proposing, implementing, and evaluating local projects, LEAs are required to identify areas impacted with high concentrations of children from low-income families, assess the special needs of children in those areas, and design projects that match available resources to identified needs. In addition to these activities, LEAs must keep adequate fiscal records and provide SEAs with annual fiscal and evaluation reports.

Title I enabling legislation and USOE regulations instituted one of the largest Federal-State-local education partnerships in the history of United States education. The legislation authorizes Federal financing of thousands of separate, autonomous, local programs operated and administered by local school boards and approved by State school and USOE authorities. USOE's primary role is to administer the program without exercising direction, supervision or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, school, or school system. The intent of the law is to let local educational agencies -- the agencies that are most acutely aware of the unique needs of local educationally deprived children -- design and implement projects that will match available resources to local needs.

USOE's strategy to insure effective administration and operation of Title I at the State level has been to monitor those activities and provide technical assistance to the States as required. Similarly, monitoring and technical assistance activities are performed by SEAs to insure LEA compliance with the letter and intent of Title I regulations.

Improvement of local project impact on participating students is accomplished by two additional strategies, namely, SEA project development/evaluation technical assistance, and USOE identification and dissemination of information about local projects that have demonstrated innovativeness and/or success. SEAs are granted up to one percent of the total State Title I allocation or $150,000, whichever is greater, to monitor and provide technical assistance to LEAs.

Program Effectiveness:

Knowledge about ESEA Title I is based primarily upon several national surveys conducted in fiscal years 1968, 1969 and 1970. These studies focus upon the context in which Title I projects operate, the needs of the disadvantaged population and the existing allocation of financial and program resources. To a much lesser extent, these surveys and other studies permit some tentative conclusions about the benefits accruing to students participating in programs for the disadvantaged. Some annual State reports also provide information about the benefits credited to Title I. Based upon all the evidence, the effects of the program are mixed. It has without doubt focused attention upon an important and heretofore neglected educational problem. Title I has also been relatively more successful than other programs in targeting money on school districts serving the disadvantaged population; the evidence indicates, however, that improvements can still be made in the delivery mechanism, especially within districts.

The needs of disadvantaged children would be better served by more concentration upon academic programs and less use of resources for general aid and ancillary services such as food and health programs. Even if perfectly allocated, however, the current level of Title I funding would not be enough to meet the identified needs of the many children with critical academic deficiencies that are not able to participate in any compensatory academic program. Attempts to measure the impact of the program on educational achievement have been less than satisfactory in that no nationally representative data can be reported. Non-representative data from samples of schools surveyed by USOE in FY 68 and 69 found that Title I participants have not shown gains in reading achievement approaching the national norms for non-disadvantaged children. However, five State Education Agencies have reported that participating students made average monthly gains approaching the norms and that children in a number of local projects in several states have exceeded the norms. Thus while progress is being made and some success can be cited, it cannot yet be reported that Title I has been effective overall in helping educationally deprived children catch up and progress at a rate equivalent to their more advantaged peers. More detailed findings are categorized into four areas: context, needs, allocation of resources and benefits.

Context

Title I is aimed at meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children. There are several plausible definitions of this target group and, of course, corresponding estimates of size. For example, based upon an FY 68 survey of teachers (reference 4) it was estimated that there were 16.8 million school-aged children who are from poor families or whose teachers do not believe will finish high school. Estimates by the National Education Finance Project (reference 9) put the size of the target population at from 11.9 to 12.5 million in FY 70. The number of economically deprived children, as determined for the Title I allocation formula in accordance with the legislation was approximately 7 million in FY 70. The latest survey data (reference 10) from FY 1970 indicated that about 7.6 million participated in the program; under Title I legislation the number of eligible children can legally be larger than the number of children counted for formula purposes and almost certainly will be. Thus the upper limit of the target group is about 16.8 million children and the lower limit, as implied by the formula count, is about 7 million.

The majority of disadvantaged students (73 percent in 1969) are enrolled in rural (50 percent) or urban (23 percent) schools. Approximately 14 percent of the total disadvantaged students in Title I schools were concentrated in schools in which poor children made up 50 percent or more of the total enrollment. Approximately 20 percent of the pupils enrolled in Title I schools are black; however, black students compose 34 percent of the disadvantaged in those schools. Also, a disproportionate number of schools with a high concentration of disadvantaged students are in large cities.

Needs:

On the basis of the FY 69 national survey of elementary schools it is estimated that approximately 5 million students in Title I elementary schools were in need of compensatory reading programs, with urban schools showing the greatest incidence of such need. Both standardized test results and teacher judgments of student critical needs over the years suggest that the major academic problem in Title I is reading retardation. On the basis of teacher estimates of their critical needs, 43 percent of the children in Title I elementary schools were judged to have a critical need for remedial reading instruction, 37 percent needed remedial instruction in language, and another 37 percent required remedial mathematics instruction. Twenty-seven percent required cultural enrichment while 11 percent needed health services, 9.5 percent psychological counseling, 6.5 percent food services, and 5.4 percent special educational services. Thirty-four percent of the children in those schools were judged to have no critical needs in these areas.

The relationship between ethnic group and need is reflected in FY 69 data. Of the black students in Title I schools during the academic year, 60 percent had a critical need for remedial reading instruction, 57 percent for language instruction, and 52 percent had a critical need for math instruction. Black students consistently showed the greatest need for compensatory education. Critical needs for compensatory education have consistently been demonstrated to be related to ethnic group membership, family income level, and urbanism of the school.

Allocation of Resources:

In the Title I allocation formula grants are proportioned to statewide or nationwide per pupil expenditures whichever is larger. As a consequence the majority of Title I participants (58%) reside in low expenditure districts (less than $425 per child per year) but these districts receive only 44% of the Title I funds. To the extent that the formula accounts for lower educational costs in these districts, the allocation is appropriate but it may also be penalizing poor districts that simply cannot raise sufficient revenue. USOE is presently studying the appropriateness of the existing formula and possible alternatives.

With respect to the kinds of services acquired by Title I, there is an emphasis on expenditures for basic skills remedial services, accounting for nearly $460 million or 42 percent of the total $1.1 billion spent on low-income and institutional programs in FY 70. Reading accounts for the greatest expenditures on remedial services, $266 million.

With respect to all academically oriented programs, 20 percent of the pupils in grades two, four, and six in Title I schools participated in one or more academic programs for the disadvantaged during FY 69. Projecting this percentage to grades one through six suggests that 2.25 million pupils participated in one or more academic programs for the disadvantaged during the 1968-69 school year. Two-thirds of the participating pupils received at least 100 hours of academic compensatory instruction during that year and the remaining third received less than 100 hours of compensatory instruction.

Evidence seems to indicate that the students with the greatest need are participating in Title I compensatory projects and are the ones receiving the most instruction; however, many students without a great need for such programs are also participating in Title I compensatory classes. For example, in FY 1969, it is estimated that 25 percent (558,000) of the students in Title I schools that were classified as neither poor nor potential dropouts participated in academic programs for the disadvantaged programs for the disadvantaged. While the need for academic programs considerably exceeded the participation in such programs the participation in certain ancillary services such as food and health programs apparently somewhat exceeded the identified need.

With respect to specific uses of Title I funds, USOE is stepping up efforts to insure that money is spent for purposes authorized under the program regulations. As a consequence of Federal audits of State Title I operations from September 1965 through June 30, 1969, HEW is seeking to recover approximately $5.6 million spent in six States and the District of Columbia for unauthorized purposes. The repayments total about 1.1% of the Title I money spent in those jurisdictions during the time period. Audits of Title I programs in other States are under review.

Benefits:

To date, no study of Title I has managed to collect standardized achivement test data on a sample of students representative of the students in the nation receiving Title I supported compensatory programs. The following conclusions are based upon FY 68 and 69 data which covered only seven to nine percent of the cases where parallel pre-post-test data on reading achievement were actually used (the percentages were smaller in other academic areas). The findings, therefore, are based on small and non-representative samples of Title I participants and should be considered only suggestive.

Although the evidence from pre-tests from the national surveys in FY 1968 and 69 suggests that reading programs are in fact being concentrated on the most needy students, Title I participants have not yet shown gains in reading achievement that approach the national norm for nondisadvantaged children. In fact, the evidence seems to indicate that Title I participants continue to fall farther and farther behind national norms for reading achievement.

In contrast to the survey results cited above, a review of the State Annual Evaluation Reports currently being conducted by the American Institutes for Research (reference 6) provides some fragmented but positive evidence on improved performance by Title I participants. Of the 91 FY 1969 and 70 State Reports reviewed, 67 (74 percent) did not present cognitive achievement data, or reported data on non-representative samples of students. Of the 24 reports that presented data on at least a "possibly representative sample of the state," only seven reports (five states) reported pre- and post-test data broken down by grade level which could be meaningfully interpreted. However, pooling math and reading achievement data across these States for grades two, four, and six resulted in the conclusion that at all grade levels participating students made average monthly gains that approached the norm for nondisadvantaged students. These findings are encouraging, positive findings but it should also be noted that these students began with such an educational deficit that on the post-test they were still seven or more months behind the norms.

Although the State-reported data described above suffers from various deficiencies it does provide some instances of positive impact. A similar picture is presented when data at the local level are reviewed. Since 1968 USOE has directed a search for successful compensatory education projects for disadvantaged children (not restricted to Title I). The latest report (reference 5) summarizes the status of 41 successes identified as a result of that search. All 41 demonstrated reliably measured cognitive achievement gains that were greater than a comparable comparison group or national norms. The study showed that approximately three percent of the projects that appeared to be successful initially, were actually verified as successes on the basis of hard evaluation data.

In summary, the fragmentary evidence on the effect of Title I on student achievement is disappointing at the national level but as the unit of analysis is narrowed from the nation as a whole to States and then to projects within States more signs of positive impact on participating children can be identified. It should also be noted that the available data is limited to FY 70 and before. Since then a number of steps have been taken which are expected to increase the impact of Title I. There has not yet been time to assess, for example, the effect of increased technical assistance, the requirement for comparability of expenditures, increased parental involvement and increased concentration of funds.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

1. Study of the Title I Formula and Sub-allocation Procedures

   This study, required by the 1970 amendments to ESEA, will compare the existing Title I formula and sub-allocation procedures with various alternatives to see if other allocation procedures would be more in keeping with legislative intent.

2. Impact of Title I on the Development of Reading Skills in Elementary Schools

   One of the main purposes of the study is to assess the impact of Title I upon gains in the development of reading skills in elementary schools. Pre- and post-tests will be administered to students from a nationally representative sample of Title I projects.

3. An Analytical Review of Title I (1965-70)

   The primary objectives of this on-going study are to review the impact of ESEA Title I in terms of population served, funds allocation and use, cognitive benefits, and their interrelations.

4. Title I Management Analysis

   The Title I guidelines provide the principal means for the Federal government to affect local spending of compensatory education funds. Numerous changes in the guidelines can be envisioned, but it is not clear that the supporting evidence to do so is available or that it is programatically advisable. Important possibilities include guidelines on the selection of project schools, the concentration of funds per pupil, financial accountability requirements, adequate local evaluations, concentration on basic skills, sequential coordination and improved planning of programs. A two part study is envisioned. Phase I is an assessment of existing data relative to the data needed to formulate guideline decisions. Phase II is the initiation of an on-site nationally representative survey to fill-in the data gaps as determined in Phase I.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Glass, G. V. Data analysis of the 1968-69 survey of compensatory education (Title I). Final Report. Boulder, Colo.: University of Colorado, Laboratory of Educational Research, August 1970.

2. Hawridge, D. G., Campeau, P. L., DeWitt, K. M., and Trickett, P. K. A Study of further selected exemplary programs for the education of disadvantaged children. Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institutes for Research, June 1969.

3. Hawkridge, D. G., Chalupsky, A. B., & Roberts, A. O. H. A study of selected exemplary programs for the education of disadvantaged children, Parts I and II. Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institutes for Research, September 1968.

4. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare/Office of Education. Education of the disadvantaged. An evaluative report on Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, fiscal year 1968. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, April, 1970.

5. Wargo, M. J., Campeau, P. L. & Tallmadge, G. K. Further examination of exemplary programs for educating disadvantaged children. Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institutes for Research, July 1971.

6. Wargo, M. J., Lipe, D. H., Tallmadge, G. K., Michaels, D. D., & Morris, S. J. An analytical review of the knowledge gained in five years of ESEA Title I about the education of disadvantaged children. Contract No. OEC-0-71-4766, in progress.

7. Wholey, J. S., White, B. F., Vogt, L.M., & Zamoff, R. B. Title I evaluation and technical assistance: Assessment and prospects. Washington, D. C.: The Urban Institute, October 1970.

8. Wholey, J. S., White B. F., Vogt, L. M., & Zamoff, R. B. Title I evaluation and technical assistance: Assessment and prospects. Appendices. Washington, D. C.: The Urban Institute, October 1970.

9. Johns, R. L. Alexander, K and Jordan, K. F. (Editors). Planning To Finance Education. Gainesville, Florida: National Education Finance Project. 1971.

10. USOE. Program statistics compiled by the U.S. Office of Education.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Supplementary Educational Centers and Services

Legislation:

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, as amended.

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History:

Year:	Authorization:	Appropriation:
FY 1966	$100,000,000	$ 75,000,000
1967	175,000,000	135,000,000
1968	500,000,000	187,876,000
1969	527,875,000	164,876,000
1970	566,500,000	130,959,000
1971	566,500,000	143,393,000
1972	592,250,000	146,693,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Title III directs the U.S. Commissioner of Education to (1) establish exemplary and innovative elementary and secondary school educational programs which will serve as models for American education, and (2) provide grants for supplementary educational centers and services which will supply vitally needed educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality. Within the context of Title III legislation, "exemplary" programs are those which can serve as models for other school systems to follow, and "innovation" is defined as an approach to any aspect of elementary and secondary education which is new to the area introducing that approach. Amendments to the Act in 1967 have stressed the importance of exemplary and innovating programs, while de-emphasizing the concept of supplementary centers and services.

The underlying rationale for Title III has been attributed to the Task Force on Education chaired by John W. Gardner, and appointed by the President in the summer of 1964. The Task Force believed that substantial educational change had failed to take place not because of a scarcity of new ideas and programs, but because the efforts to innovate and the mechanisms to dissiminate innovative ideas had been on a scale far below the actual need. Title III, through its direct support for innovation, was intended to help meet that need.

Each State qualifies for funding by submitting an annual State Plan to the U.S. Commissioner of Education for approval. Funds are then allocated to the States on the basis of a population proportional formula. There are few restrictions on the use of Title III funds, except for the 15% which must be used for projects for the handicapped. The Administrative Manual for ESEA Title III states that projects may be developed which (1) invent a creative solution to a problem; (2) demonstrate an exemplary program which might be suitable for widespread use; or (3) adapt an exemplary program to local requirements and organize its incorporation into the educational program. Each State plan must contain assurances that not less than fifty percent of the funds under Title III will be used to plan, establish or expand innovative and exemplary programs. In addition, each State must assure expenditures for guidance, testing and counseling equal to 50% of what that State spent for Title V-A of the National Defense Education Act, in 1970. Title III clearly reflects the OE strategy of demonstrating promising practices and programs, in order to encourage a more rapid degree of innovation at the local level.

Beginning with FY 71, the States were responsible for administering 85% of the Title III money, by awarding grants to local school districts which submitted worthy proposals. Local projects are usually continued for a period of three years; however, projects not making satisfactory progress are terminated earlier. The Commissioner of Education has responsibility for administering the remaining 15% of the funds allocated each year. This portion of discretionary money also supports local school projects, but gives the Commissioner additional flexibility to demonstrate exemplary programs on a national basis. Prior to FY 72, the administration of program funds had fluctuated, with the States assuming responsibility for 75% of the funds in FY 69, and for 100% in FY 70.

Program Effectiveness:

Quantitative data on the numbers and kinds of people served by Title III, uses of funds by subject area, and comparisons between the extent of Title III usage and other Federal funds are compiled by the Consolidated Program Information Report.

More substantive data are provided by a variety of outside contracts. An additional source of information is the National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services, which reports annually on a sample of Title III projects surveyed. Although past attempts to assess this program have sometimes resulted in contradictory conclusions, more recent evaluations have generally supported the program's attempts to stimulate local innovation. Some of the studies have also indicated which characteristics seem related to successful continuation of local projects.

During the school year 1970-71, Title III served 14,180,000 students through support of 240 new projects and 841 continuing projects.

During the school year 1969-70 (including the summer term of 1970), Title III served a total of 8,329,936 individuals in the public schools, and 713,856 persons in the non-public schools. In addition, approximately 139,861 public school teachers and 3,796 aides received in-service training with Title III funds, as did 11,397 non-public school teachers. (See 8 below:. Figures do not reflect funds of States Offices and Regional Centers).

The following chart shows the amount of Title III funds used for various target groups during the 1969-70 school year and the 1970 summer term. (See 8 below).

Estimated Amount of LEA Title III Expenditures by Target Group
(public and non-public participants)

General elementary and secondary population	$51,305,000
Children from low-income areas	39,805,000
Handicapped	14,836,000
Adults	2,491,000
Non-standard English speaking	2,111,000
Dropouts or potential dropouts	1,416,000
Migrants	135,000
Neglected and deliquent children	116,000
TOTAL	$112,215,000

Projects funded in FY 70 focused on the following major areas: basic skills in reading, mathematics, and language development; development of school personnel; improvement in school management and school administration; special programs for the handicapped; and vocational education and training.

Because the Title III program is not aimed at a particular target group or subject matter area, but instead supports a diversity of activities and objectives and no single baseline against which to measure progress, it has been difficult to assess its effectiveness. A number of efforts have been made to evaluate the overall impact of the title. Although some of the studies' recommendations were contradictory, they generally agreed that there should be higher funding levels for Title III, more local involvement, better evaluation and dissemination of programs, and more emphasis on dealing with critical national and State educational needs.

The first study of the program was funded by the Office through a grant to the University of Kentucky. The resulting report, Catalyst for Change: A National Study of ESEA Title III (PACE), examined title III during its 1st year of operation. The study found that more than 80 percent of the projects funded by title III during its 1st year included the adoption of new methods as one of their activities. The study criticized the projects, however, for inadequate involvement of community resources.

Another study was launched after the 2nd year of operation by the same panel of experts. Five reports focusing on different aspects of evaluation were produced by the group. (See reference 2 below). It was pointed out that "the continuation of support for Title III ... must rest on the fact that it is enabling the schools to provide learning opportunities, to innovate as they otherwise would not, in ways that are generally judged valuable by educationist and layman alike."

The group's reports also stressed the importance of project evaluation, higher funding levels, and the continuation of projects beyond 3 years. It was also recommended that State advisory councils assume major roles in encouraging local innovation.

A third assessment of the program was made by Charles S. Benson and James W. Guthrie, and was based on site visits to 60 Title III projects selected by the Office of Education.

According to this survey, the primary objective of over 22 percent of the projects studied was curriculum enrichment; about the same proportion focused on instructional improvement. Some 53 percent of the projects were considered innovative: 47 percent were considered exemplary.

Although no definitive data had been collected at the time to indicate a rise in achievement levels, the study concluded that Title III was creating conditions which would bring about significant gains in students' achievements. It considered Title III to have been particularly effective in areas such as:

> (1) experimentation with new instructional modes and curricula formats; (2) development and adoption of useful new educational technology; and (3) establishment of exemplary special education programs.

The Benson and Guthrie study judged two-thirds of the 60 projects visited to be outstanding successes. The authors found that projects serving relatively small target groups, having good physical facilities, involving other community agencies, and seeking information from outside sources in planning and operating activities tended to be successful. Unsuccessful projects were characterized by large target populations and a relatively small per pupil expenditure of funds. These projects often were poorly administered and inappropriately staffed, were based on inadequately developed ideas, and frequently met with resistance from the "regular" school staffs.

The first evaluation of Title III by the President's National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services was contained in a report issued in January 1969, entitled PACE: Transition of a Concept. Assessment of Title III was based on conference proceedings, site visits to projects, and a number of documents and reports made available to the Council. The Council concluded that Title III "is in a unique position to serve as a catalyst" for innovation in education, but indicated a number of problem areas. These included the difficulty of defining an "innovation," development of appropriate evaluative procedures, promotion of effective relationships between school districts and individual projects, evolution of good management processes, and the timing of funds.

Anthony John Polemeni's Study of Title III Projects, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, after the Approved Funding Periods dealt only with projects which were completed or terminated by December 1967. Of the 149 projects surveyed, 120 were discontinued after Title III funds were terminated; another five were discontinued shortly thereafter; and 24 were still in operation in fiscal 1969. The study contends that the relatively low level of continuation was due to the projects' inability to continue the "seed money" objective of the legislation. However, Polemeni held that a 16 percent continuation rate for projects supported by "risk money" was not a discouraging "rate of return." Project directors gave "inability to absorb the costs" as the major reason for the projects not being continued with local funds.

Another study, by OE, (Innovative Educational Programs: A Study of the Influence of Selected Variables Upon Their Continuation Following the Termination of Three Year Title III Grants.) also focused on the continuation of projects initially supported by Title III funds, but on a different population -- school district superintendents. Its most significant finding was that among 256 projects which responded to a mail survey, 85% were continued by local school systems after Title III support was discontinued; of these continuations, 42% were continued on a smaller scale, 32% were continued on the same scale, and 11% were continued on a larger scale. The study also found that:

1) The average project was responsible for stimulating 20 similar new programs in other schools.

2) Continued projects served larger numbers of pupils; had larger budget for training, evaluation, and dissemination; had greater school board and student involvement in their development; and

included activities that were major additions to or reorganizations of the school or curriculum.

One of the most recent reports on the Title III program is The Rocky Road Called Innovation, the second annual report of the President's National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services, which was submitted to Congress and the President in January 1970. This report deals with the progress and problems of the program during fiscal 1969. The Council's major conclusions about the program were that: Title III is working; the original emphasis on innovative and creative programs is being eroded and chipped away, with the movement being toward projects which are designed to provide services; and educators need to re-examine their commitment to innovation and change.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Quantitative data on Title III projects will continue to be collected and analyzed annually, through the Consolidated Program Information Report. Other descriptive data will continue to be provided through reports from the National Advisory Council.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Catalyst for Change: A National Study of ESEA Title III (PACE); 1967
2. Evaluation and PACE; 1968 PACE: Catalyst for Change The Views of 920 PACE Project Directors; Analysis and Evaluation of 137 ESEA Title III Grants; A Comprehensive Model for Managing an ESEA Title III Project from Conception to Culmination
3. An Essay on Federal Incentives and Local and State Educational Initiative (Benson and Guthrie); 1968
4. A Study of Title III Projects, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, After the Approved Funding Periods (Anthony Polemeni); 1969
5. Innovative Educational Programs: A Study of the Influence of Selected Variables Upon Their Continuation Following the Termination of Three Year Title III Grants (Norman Hearn); 1969
6. PACE: Transition of a Concept. Report of the President's National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services; 1969
7. The Rocky Road Called Innovation. Report of the President's National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and services; 1970

8. Consolidated Program Information Report. (OE reporting form designated to gather and present data useful in program planning at the Federal, State and local level.)

9. Survey of State Title III ESEA Reports, FY 70 (OE survey to gather financial and programmatic data at the State level.)

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Strengthening State Departments of Education

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
ESEA Title V, Part A	6/30/73

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	0	0
1966	35,800,000	24,750,000
1967	40,800,000	29,750,000
1968	65,000,000	29,750,000
1969	88,000,000	29,750,000
1970	80,000,000	29,750,000
1971	80,000,000	29,750,000
1972	85,000,000	33,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Under the ESEA Title V, Part A, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants to stimulate and assist States in strengthening the leadership resources of their education agencies and to assist these agencies in establishing and improving programs to identify and meet their educational needs. The grants are made to each SEA on the basis of project applications. OE approval of these State applications is required, following a determination that they conform to the broad purposes of Title V.

Ninety-five percent of the Title V, Part A appropriation is available to State education agencies as basic grants. Each State's basic grant is based on a funding formula which distributes 40% of the appropriation money equally among the States and 60% on the basis of the number of children in each State. The remaining five percent of the appropriation is reserved for special project grants to State education agencies to enable groups of these agencies to develop their leadership capabilities through experimental projects and to solve high priority common problems.

OE strategy is based on providing technical assistance to the States through a variety of mechanisms. Annual grant application forms require that States identify their needs and report their accomplishments for each year. By this process, State planning activities have been encouraged. A system of State Management Reviews carried out by OE has provided each State with an in-depth analysis and evaluation of its management techniques. Technical assistance was provided to States which wished to develop uniform categorical aid project applications for their LEAs. Workshops and conferences have been used to air problems common to several States and to devise solutions.

Program Effectiveness:

For each year since 1966, with the funds appropriated under Title V, a variety of projects have been undertaken and are reported in the annual reports of the Advisory Council on State Departments of Education. No formal evaluation of the effectiveness of Title V in achieving its legislative goals has been completed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Center for Educational Policy Research at Harvard is conducting an in-depth survey of five States to analyze the uses and effectiveness of Title V grant money. In addition, a survey by questionnaire of all Chief State School Officers is contemplated.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Center for Educational Policy Research, Harvard University, Title V of ESEA, Decentralization, and Responsive Government, Interim Report.

2. Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, The Federal-State Partnership for Education, May 1970.

3. Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, The State of State Departments of Education, March 1969.

4. Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, Focus on the Future, March 1968.

5. Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, Reinforcing the Role of the State in Education, March 1967.

6. Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, Improving State Leadership in Education, March 1966.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Bilingual Education

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Bilingual Education Act (Title VII, ESEA)	June 30, 1973

Funding History:	Year:	Authorization:	Appropriation:
	FY 68	$15,000,000	$ 0
	FY 69	30,000,000	7,500,000
	FY 70	40,000,000	21,250,000
	FY 71	80,000,000	25,000,000
	FY 72	100,000,000	35,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Bilingual Education Program is designed to meet the special educational needs of children who come from environments where the dominant language is not English. There are an estimated five million children in the United States who are eligible under the law. These figures are based upon several sources: 1960 and 1970 Census Data, 1969 Sample Household Census Data, Immigrant Statistics, Civil Rights Data, Data from the Smithsonian Institute on Indian Populations, and estimates from State Education Agencies. Some of these children know little or no English when they enter school; however, many of them are fluent in their home language. Hence, a special program which uses both languages as media of instruction is needed to teach language skills in both languages and to foster legitimate pride in both cultures. Discretionary grants are given (1) to a local educational agency or group of such agencies or (2) to a local educational agency or agencies jointly with an institution of higher learning to initiate bilingual projects. During its three years of operation, the Bilingual Education Program has become more and more of an educational service program, rather than a demonstration one. This year, FY 72, there are 164 projects, approximately 20 percent of which may be regarded as demonstration projects.

Program Effectiveness:

The prime sources of data concerning program effectiveness are the evaluation reports submitted annually by each project. These local evaluations are supposed to be used as tools for project refinement and change. Thus, each local evaluator may choose the tests and evaluation procedures to use. This practice has yielded evaluation reports which are so dissimilar that comparisons cannot be made across projects, even though certain objectives (such as improved fluency in English and the home language, etc.) are common to all projects. In addition data collection and analysis methods often are poor in the local evaluations. Some of the major problems are: the absence of adequate comparison groups and the reporting only of pre- and post-raw scores on normed tests. This practice prevents comparison of experimental groups with measures of national performance and prevents meaningful interpretation of the difference. Thus, there is no documentation of the effectiveness of the bilingual program as a whole. This does not mean that the program is not effective, it merely means that the data needed to make this judgment are not available.

On the other hand, there is some impressionistic and anecdotal evidence that some of the well-run programs are effectively achieving program goals. This evidence was gathered from local evaluation reports by the OE staff on the 76 projects started during school year 1969-70. At the end of school year 1969-70, 34 projects (45%) felt that academic improvement had come about, whereas only 7 projects expressed uncertainty or other negative reactions. In addition 34 projects (not necessarily the same ones) felt that there was improvement in other areas, such as in self-concept, verbalization in either language, group participation, etc. These beliefs are not necessarily supported by data.

In addition to the general impressionistic evidence that the program is effective, there are isolated and scattered bits of statistical evidence supporting this contention which have been culled from local evaluation reports by the Office of Education. These bits of statistical evidence and the program goals they relate to follow.

1. One program objective is to develop greater competency in English in the target population. It was reported that kindergarten children in the Portuguese bilingual project in Artesia, California scored 80% on the Metropolitan Reading Tests at the end of kindergarten program, exceeding the national norm by 30%. The experimental first grades in the same program reached the level of 2.2 on the Cooperative Primary Test as compared with the district average of 1.8 and the national average of 1.9. In the San Juan school district (Monticello, Utah) both Navajo and non-Navajo pupils made significantly greater gains in academic achievement during the 1970-71 school-year than did their counterparts in the control schools. In Las Cruces, New Mexico, the fourth-grade children in the bilingual program did significantly better in General Ability Test, Inter-American Test Series than did their counterparts in the control schools.

2. Another program objective is to develop greater competency in the home language. Results in New York City and Las Cruces indicate that children in the bilingual program made significantly greater gains in Spanish language skills than children in control groups. It must be remembered that children in control classes were not receiving formal

instruction in Spanish, and therefore could not be expected to perform as well on a paper-and-pencil test as the children in the bilingual program.

3. A long-range program goal is to reduce drop-out rate of the minority students. A short-range version of this objective is to reduce number of absences during a given year. In Redwood City, California the bilingual program measured a 70% reduction in number of absences during the year, whereas in the comparison group absences were only reduced by 62%. This difference, however, may not be statistically significant.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

A national evaluation of the Title VII programs is planned for the 1972-73 academic year; background work for this evaluation is being done now. The goals of this evaluation are twofold: to assess the overall effectiveness of the bilingual program and to identify promising strategies and models. Overall effectiveness will be assessed in cognitive, affective, and behavioral domains. All variables which will be measured in these domains have been derived from program objectives listed in program Guidelines. The promising strategies and models will be variations of four basic program components delineated in the Guidelines, viz. instruction, material acquisition and/or development, staff development, and community involvement.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Individual Project Evaluation Reports

2. Programs under Bilingual Education Act (Title VII, ESEA): Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees (April 15, 1971).

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Dropout Prevention

Legislation:

Title VIII ESEA, **Section** 807

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History:

Year (FY)	Authorization	Appropriation
1969	$30,000,000	$ 5,000,000
1970	30,000,000	5,000,000
1971	30,000,000	10,000,000
1972	31,500,000	10,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

For the 1969-1971 period grants were awarded to ten school systems submiting the most imaginative proposals for reducing the number of secondary education students leaving school before graduating. For FY 1972 an additional nine grants were awarded. Each of the funded projects must demonstrate ways for reducing the dropout rates in their school systems as well as providing insights for possible replication of their projects in other school systems.

Results from the first ten projects are available and discussed herein. These diverse projects are: Dropout Prevention through Performance Contracting in Texarkana, Arkansas; Dade County Talent Development Program in Dade County, Florida; Focus on Dropouts ... A New Design in Paducah and Louisville, Kentucky; Keep All Pupils in School (KAPS) in Baltimore, Maryland; Project Process for Student Success in Fall River, Massachusetts; Project Stay in St. Louis, Missouri; Potential Dropout Recognition and Prevention Program in Fredonia, New York; Project Emerge in Dayton, Ohio; Parental Attitude and Student Retention Program in Batesland, South Dakota; and Central Area Dropout Reduction Experiment (CADRE) in Seattle, Washington. Some 49,227 students were involved in these projects.

Counseling services, staff training and curriculum or instructional revision were common activities to all projects. Six projects conducted work-study or other vocational course; two offered special services for pregnant students; and four placed major emphasis on parental involvement. One project provided a "Personal Development Center" in an off-school facility for holding informal sessions for students who were unable to relate to conventional instruction.

In each funded project independent audits of evaluation and management designs were required for the purpose of determining the nature of management and program practices of project personnel. Auditors' interim and final reports, evaluation reports from each project, and the USOE personnel participation provide the basis for gaining insights into the operation and progress of each project.

Program Effectiveness:

Information about the Dropout Prevention Program comes from two main sources: (1) the Consolidated Program Information Report which provides data primarily upon expenditures and program participation and (2) evaluation reports and individual audits on each local project. The evidence from these reports indicates that the Dropout Prevention Program is well-focused upon it s target population and that most projects have been effective in reducing the dropout rate. Since evaluations are carried out by individual projects using distinctively different data bases, the results obtained were not comparable across all projects, and therefore measures of effectiveness for selected program components could not be made.

Expenditures in FY 70 were concentrated upon two classifications of children: (1) dropouts, potential dropouts and former dropouts (76%) and (2) low-income children (22%). The main categories of expenditures were teaching of basic skills (18%) and vocational skills and attitudes (26%) and pupil services such as guidance and counseling, psychological services and student subsidies (19%).

Even though the USOE provided a definition of dropout to be used, most of the projects were unable to report accurate figures because of incomplete and inconsistent records on their students. The results discussed herein are for individual projects that have internally consistent data. Data provided from individual projects did indicate that the dropout rate has been reduced in most localities. In Texarkana, St. Louis and Batesland, the rates decreased from 8.34 to 4.27 percent, from 11.04 to 8.97 percent, and from 18.67 to 8.84 percent respectively between 1969-70 and 1970-71. Reductions were reported, too, in Fall River, Fredonia, and Dayton. The rate at the target junior high school in the Baltimore project declined from 8.8 to 7.2 percent, but it increased at the target senior high from 10.2 to 16.4 percent. In the two-part Kentucky project, the rate decreased in Paducah but increased slightly in Louisville. The numbers of dropouts from the Dade County target junior and senior high schools are reported to have decreased, but the rate of decrease was greater among students who did not participate in the project. Comparisons between 1969-70 and 1970-71 dropout rates in Seattle were not possible, since the composition of the schools changed radically within this period.

LEA records were used almost exclusively to determine dropout rates, which resulted in many difficulties for a general evaluation. The most significant is that students who drop out between school years do not often appear in dropout statistics. Another is the problem of the summer dropouts who are not followed-up. These and other administrative difficulties must be resolved if a realistic national dropout rate is to be determined by accounting for the vagaries of data collection.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Evaluations of the nine new funded projects in FY 72 are expected to be completed before the end of the fiscal year by the individual project auditors. No overall program evaluation is planned at this time.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. "Review and Assessment of Evaluation Results for Dropout Prevention Projects" Title VIII ESEA FY 1971 by William J. Mertens, Contract Number OEC-0-72-0648 (This report is based upon reviews of evaluation and audit reports from individual dropout prevention projects).

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Financial Assistance for Strengthening Instruction in Science, Mathematics, Modern Foreign Languages and Other Critical Subjects.

Legislation: Expiration Date:

NDEA Title III (P.L. 85-864) June 30, 1972

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	$ 100,000,000	$ 76,600,000
	1966	110,000,000	88,200,000
	1967	110,000,000	88,200,000
	1968	120,000,000	82,700,000
	1969	204,873,000	78,740,000
	1970	290,500,000	37,179,000
	1971	140,500,000	50,000,000
	1972	140,500,000	50,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Initially, Title III had two primary objectives: (1) To support the purchase of laboratory and other special equipment and materials as well as the cost of minor remodeling of facilities to accommodate equipment for elementary and secondary school instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languate; and (2) To strengthen State leadership capacity for improving instruction in these three areas. The Federal Government contributed up to 50 percent of the costs of State education agency staff improvement and the costs of equipment, materials, and minor remodeling; State and local education agencies provided the remaining funds.

Through NDEA Title III support for equipment and minor remodeling, Congress intended the improvement of instruction to take place in a number of ways, including:

(1) Increasing enrollments in science, mathematics, and modern foreign language.

(2) Increasing the number of advanced courses in the three subjects.

(3) Increasing the number of laboratory sciences and modern foreign language.

(4) Changing the methods of teaching foreign language to improve skill in speaking.

(5) Emphasizing laboratory practice in teaching science.

Through Title III support, Congress encouraged States to hire additional specialists in the three subject areas so that State agencies would be able to provide leadership to local education agencies for:

(1) Developing up-to-date curriculums

(2) Planning appropriate course sequences for elementary grades through high school

(3) Assisting in the selection of high-quality equipment and materials and enabling local education agencies to finance their purchases

(4) Providing demonstrations of new equipment and materials

(5) Conducting workshops and conferences to train teachers and other school personnel in new methodology, equipment, and materials

(6) Preparing publications and other materials to keep teachers and other school staff informed of developments in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign language.

Congress authorized the use of Title III to support SEA staff development because in 1958, the status of supervisory services was found to be inadequate, as noted in the Report of the House Committee on Education and Labor:

> Although adequate State leadership and supervisory service is widely recognized as vital to the development, maintenance, and improvement of sound classroom instruction, only two States have full-time supervisors in mathematics; six States have full-time supervisors in mathematics and science; and only two States have supervisors in foreign language instruction.

Soon after Title III was put into operation, educators and Members of Congress thought that other subjects in the curriculum needed similar attention. Reading and writing skills, for example, were not believed to be meeting acceptable standards. Similarly, Congress was concerned that students were insufficiently familiar with historical events, with the American form of government, and with characteristics of the earth. As a result, in 1964 Congress amended the NDEA and extended support--under Title III (P.L. 88-665)—to five additional subjects; history, civics, geography, English, and reading.

In 1965, as a part of the Higher Education Act (P.L. 89-329), Congress extended assistance to instruction in economics. A 10th subject, industrial arts, was added as a part of the Higher Education Amendments of 1966 (P.L. 89-752).

Under the Higher Education Amendment of 1968 (P.L. 90-575), Title III of NDEA was amended further. A new Part B now authorizes assistance for "the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in school attendance areas having a high concentration of children from low-income families." However, no funds for Part D have ever been appropriated. By providing support for the seven additional subjects and by other changes, Congress has shown that its intent is broader than was indicated in NDEA as originally enacted.

This program also provides grants to the States for the cost of administering this program, and loans to private nonprofit schools for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling.

Each State is allotted funds for administration of the program, including salaries and expenses of State Title III staff, on the basis of the State's proportion of the schoolage population in the Nation, with a stipulation that each State receive at least $50,000. A separate formula is used to determine State allotments for distribution to local education agencies in support of approved projects -- involving equipment, materials, and minor remodeling. In this second formula the allocation is inversely proportional to per capita personal income in the State.

Except for a small portion retained for use in State-supported schools, most of a State's Title III allotment for equipment, materials, and minor remodeling is distributed by the State education agency to local education. agencies for specific projects. Each State determines local education agency eligibility and establishes State funding priorities. Although the Federal funds cannot exceed 50 percent of the cost of a project, the matching half of the cost may be provided by the State or the local education agency. Each State sets criteria for the State-local matching pattern. Almost all of the matching funds are provided by local education agencies.

Program Effectiveness:

No comprehensive evaluation of this program has been conducted. What measures of effectiveness we have come from the NDEA-III reports the States submit annually to OE.[2] Program data describing the expenditures and population served under this Title come from the 1970 Consolidated Program Information Report.[3]

Funds made available in FY 1970 and 71 were overmatched by State and local educational agencies by a 52 to 48 ratio. Almost $200,000,000 were spent for projects at the local level in FY 70 and 71. Approximately $87,000,000 came from the Federal government with the balance coming from State and local governments.

Federal expenditures under NDEA III amounted to $34.6 million for FY 70. These funds are focused on the general elementary and secondary population (81.5 percent) and children from low income areas (16.5 percent).[3]

Federal expenditures by subject areas, for the most part, are concentrated on natural science (32 percent), English (26 percent), and social science/ social studies (16 percent).

Data on the effectiveness of NDEA-III, in contrast to the descriptive program data above, are in short supply. In their annual reports almost all States report that student achievement in the critical subjects (i.e. subjects for which NDEA-III money is available) improved. Almost all States report observations of student growth and development in attitudes, values, appreciation, and human relations. Other States speak of improvement in abilities for self-analysis and self-evaluation; in relationships with peers, in abilities to explore, to inquire, to experiment, etc. In short, many positive program effects are reported; whether these outcomes, if in fact they have occurred, can be attributed in whole or in part to NDEA-III activities cannot be ascertained since the evidence in the State reports is largely anecdotal and not supported by methodologically sound evaluation studies.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. USOE, NDEA Title III, Fiscal Year 1959-67, A Management View, May, 1969.

2. Strengthening Instruction in Science, Mathematics, Foreign Languages, and the Humanities and Arts, a chapter appearing the The Federal-State Partnership for Education, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, May, 1970.

3. USOE, Program Statistics compiled by the U.S. Office of Education.

4. USOE, Strengthening Instruction In Academic Subjects.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Follow Through

Legislation:

Economic Opportunity Act of
1964 (P.L. 88-452 as amended)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1976

Funding History:

Year	Appropriation
1968	$15,000,000
1969	32,000,000
1970	70,300,000
1971	69,000,000
1972	60,030,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Follow Through is an experimental program with the purpose to investigate a variety of approaches to reinforce gains made in Headstart or similar pre-school programs by children from impoverished families. Provisions are also made for assessing abilities and gains of such children who have not had pre-school experiences. Twenty-two different models of Follow Through are being tried, most at several sites. Each model is designed, implemented, and monitored by a sponsoring group. Currently, there are approximately 150,000 children from improverished families who have attended pre-school. Children from similar backgrounds could no doubt benefit from successful compensatory Follow Through efforts. Approximately 4 million such children enrolled in kindergarten through third grade.

The U.S. Office of Education funds local projects that are nominated by the State Education Agency and the State Economic Opportunity Office in accordance with OE and OEO criteria. Up to 20% of the appropriation may be awarded at the discretion of OE. The other 80% is allotted to the States in accordance with a formula established in the legislation.

Program Effectiveness:

The evaluation plans for Follow Through specify a comparison of the impacts of the twenty-two different models used. More specifically, the evaluation is designed to identify which approaches are successful in producing educationally significant gains in cognitive achievement, in positive attitude towards schooling, and in parental ability to share in determining the nature of their children's education. One-hundred and fifty sites throughout the country are involved in the evaluation. The evaluation study is longitudinal and involves testing several thousand children and their parents at intervals so that gains, and levels of understanding and participation can be assessed. A sample of children not in the program are tested to form a basis of comparison against children in the Follow Through Program. Preliminary findings show that children participating in the Follow Through Program had a small edge in achievement gains over non-Follow Through children. The educational significance of these differences is presently being assessed. Testing is scheduled again for the end of the 1971-72 academic year with somewhat more definite results expected by the fall of 1972 that may confirm the trends now evident. The effectiveness of Follow Through as measured by pupil attitudes toward school and interpersonal feelings showed negative results for both Follow Through and non-Follow Through pupils. For these two variables participation in Follow Through showed a more negative impact on pupils as contrasted with non-participating pupils for the fall and spring testing periods. Again the differences were small and inconclusive, yet a pattern was established suggesting further investigation. Several changes are urgently required in the overall management of this program assessment if subsequent evaluations are to live up to expectation. Some suggestions and recommendations have been made as a result of a government audit of the program. A "Consumers Guide" is currently being planned to assist LEAs in selecting from among the most successful compensatory education programs.

In FY 72, approximately 85,000 children will be in Follow Through. 75,000 of these children meet OEO's poverty criteria. The FY 72 budget is a 15% reduction from FY 71; this cutback represents the first stage of phasing out this experimental program.

For purposes of an interim evaluation, sponsors with similar programs were grouped into clusters and data were presented by cluster. Data on individual sponsors will be available in the fall of 1972 and are expected to provide substantive information on the effectiveness of specific models used in Follow Through.

Even though the differences are small as noted above, some sponsor groups did show some consistent gains. The sponsor-cluster that most often producted achievement gains is composed of sponsors "who make extensive use of programmed learning, teaching devices, structured curriculum broken into small units of learning, and systematic reinforcement and reward." The only other sponsor-cluster that showed notable achievement gains was composed of parent sponsored projects which had no affiliation with an outside group or commitment to a particular instructional model. No data from the OE evaluation study are available yet on individual sponsors, but individual reports from some of the sponsors in the other cluster indicate that some other instructional models may also be producing positive results. One sponsor found cases among his projects in which Follow Through children made substantial IQ gains (at one site the average gain was 12 points) whereas a comparison group of non-Follow Through children had a negligible average gain. Another sponsor reported that achievement by Follow Through children was comparable to that of a non-low income comparison group. These two sponsors are in sponsor clusters in the OE evaluation study which did not show substantial gain.

When achievement test scores of Follow Through children in all programs were aggregated, Follow Through children in kindergarten, first graders who had been in kindergarten, and first graders who had not been in kindergarten had gains that were greater than similar non-Follow Through children. Differences between Follow Through and comparison children for first graders who had been in kindergarten and second graders did not differ significantly. These conclusions are tentative because (1) they are based on very short-term and therefore inconclusive data and (2) many of the sponsor models do not emphasize development of academic skills during the first year.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Stanford Research Institute is under contract to OE to provide the longitudinal evaluation of Follow Through. (It is the preliminary results of that study which are presented in this report). Data from the academic year 1970-1971 will be reported to OE in a "mini guide" in February 1972 and in more detailed technical report in May, 1972. Data from academic year 1971-72 will be the first OE data presented seprately for each sponsor, thereby allowing comparison.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Stanford Research Institute's Longitudinal evaluation of selection features of the national Follow Through Program. Draft, March 1971. This study is being conducted under contract to OE.

2. Reports from individual sponsors and projects received by the OE Follow Through staff.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas - Maintenance and Operation

Legislation:

P. L. 81-874

Expiration Date:

7/1/73*

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	$359,450,000	$332,000,000
1966	388,000,000	388,000,000
1967	433,400,000	416,200,000
1968	461,500,000	416,200,000
1969	560,950,000	505,900,000
1970	650,594,000	505,400,000
1971	935,295,000	536,068,000
1972	1,038,440,000	592,580,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

P. L. 81-874 provides financial aid for maintenance and operation in school districts which have been affected by the existence of Federal installations in these areas. The purpose of the legislation is to minimize the fiscal inequities caused by both the presence of tax-exempt Federal lands and the burden of providing public school education to school children of Federal employees and some others. Payments are made directly to the LEAs and are based on local education costs and on the number of children whose parents live on United States government property or work for the United States Government (designated 3b pupils), or who do both (designated as 3a pupils), or with a parent in the uniformed services (also designated 3b pupils). Also under this law, some losses to a school district resulting from a disaster are reimbursable provided the district is included in a major disaster area as proclaimed by the President.

S.A.F.A. is the closest approximation of general aid from the Federal Government available to eligible school districts. No requirements exist on the purposes for which the Federal aid can be spent (other than for maintenance and operation) or that the LEA spend these funds directly on the children counted. Thus in 1969, while the number of school children counted for aid purposes was 2,632,689, the total number of children attending schools in these eligible LEAs amounted to 24,000,200. Some or all of these children could conceivably benefit from the SAFA aid. In calculating entitlements, school districts are reimbursed for the local cost of 3a pupils and for half of the local cost for 3b pupils.

---

* Provisions pertaining to 3(a) pupils and children attending schools on Federal installations are permanent.

Program Effectiveness:

The SAFA program is not designed to produce measurable outcomes in school children. However, in the implementation of this legislation various anomalies have appeared. These have been amply documented in an extensive study conducted by the Battelle Memorial Institute under the direction of the U. S. Office of Education. The study concludes that certain school districts are being over-compensated for the real or presumed burden of Federal activity as a result of one or more of the following situations:

1. Payments that far exceed the cost to the local government of educating Federal pupils.

2. Payments to wealthy school districts which could finance better-than-average school costs even without SAFA aid.

3. Payments to districts where the economic activity occurring on non-taxable Federal lands (e.g., a leased oil well or an aircraft company on Federal property) generates enough local taxes to support increased school costs.

4. Payments to school districts which are compensated twice for the same government impact under different Federal legislation. For example, some districts benefit from shared revenues, such as timber and Taylor grazing revenues from public lands and are entitled to impact aid under P.L. 81-874. "Because impact aid is based upon the student population rather than property characteristics, the two payments frequently overlap to the benefit of the school district."

5. Some overcompensation to school districts since States are prevented from considering SAFA aid payments in calculating State aid. Districts which are entitled to impact aid benefit from those State aid formulas which attempt equalization. In some SAFA districts, the presence of Federal land **reduces** the per pupil assessed valuation causing State aid payments to rise.

6. Higher per pupil payments to rich districts than to poor ones resulting from the inclusion of local expenditure in calculating the aid formula.

7. Children are counted who would be attending school in a district even if the Federal Government had never come into the area. As an example, Battelle cites the case of farmers who take employment at an airbase and still maintain their farm residences in neighboring school districts which may now qualify for SAFA aid.

8. Payments that often do not reflect the economic stimulus that the Federal Government may cause in a community.

In a few instances, school districts are underpaid under the present law. For example, in one school district, government-owned house trailers were parked on private property near an airbase. In this instance, neither the airbase nor the trailers were subject to taxation and the school district was only able to impose property taxes on the relatively poor land on which the trailers were parked. In determining its entitlement, the school district was paid on the basis of 3b pupils because the residence was on private taxable property.

As a result of these observations, Battelle proposed specific changes in the legislative formula. Payments should be reduced to school districts for the so-called 3b students, i.e., those students whose parents work on Federal property but live on private property by alternating the following:

(1) Absorption - Paying only for those students in a school district that exceed the Federal impact on all districts. This average impact for Federal activity was estimated at 3% of non-Federal students for the country as a whole. Under the present law, when the number of eligible students in any LEA exceed 3% of the non-Federal enrollment by even one student, then all of the eligible are counted for impacted aid purposes.

(2) Alternation in rate of payment - Changing the payment rate for (b) pupils from the current level of 50% of the (a) students, i.e., those whose parents live and work on Federal property, to 40% of the (a) students. The rationale offered for this change is that school districts are presumed only to lose an estimated 40% of property tax revenues normally paid by business, which, for the parents of (b) students, is the untaxable Federal property where they work.

(3) Richness cutoffs - Reducing or eliminating districts that have an average tax base that is 25% above State average per pupil tax base. The present law has no such cut-off.

Battelle also suggested that the local tax effort be taken into account in devising any formula changes; that Federal in-lieu-of-tax payments, shared revenues and other special payments be deducted from impact aid payments; and that the capital cost program (P.L. 815) be merged with the operating cost program (P.L. 874).

Legislation growing out of these findings was contained in the Administration Reform Proposals transmitted to Congress on February 27, 1970. To date, none of these proposals have been acted upon.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Battelle Memorial Institute, School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: A Study of Public Laws 81-874 and 81-915, published by Committee on Education and Labor, H.R., 91st Congress, 2nd Session, G.P.O., 1970.

2. Administration of Public Laws 81-974 and 81-815. Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, G.P.O., 1970.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: Construction

Legislation	Expiration Date
P. L. 815	7/1/73

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	$58,400,000	$58,400,000
1966	50,078,000	50,078,000
1967	58,000,000	52,937,000
1968	80,620,000	22,937,000
1969	79,162,000	15,153,000
1970	80,407,000	15,181,000
1971	83,000,000	15,000,000
1972	91,250,000	20,040,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

P. L. 81-815 is designed to provide local education agencies with financial aid for school construction under specified conditions. P. L. 81-815 authorizes financial assistance to eligible LEAs for construction of urgently needed minimum school facilities in school districts which have had substantial increases in school membership as a result of new or increased Federal activities (Section 5). Financial assistance is also available to a school district for the construction of temporary school facilities where the Federal impact is expected to be temporary (Section 9). The law also allows financial aid for school construction on Federal installations when no State or local education agencies can legally do so and on Federal installations in certain designated territories (Section 10). Assistance is also authorized for construction of minimum school facilities to local education agencies serving Indians (Section 14). Emergency aid is available to LEAs for the reconstruction of schools in school districts included in areas declared to be major disaster areas (Section 16).

Since FY 1967, Federal funds authorized for P. L. 81-815 have been substantially below the amounts required for funding of all qualified applicants under the Act. OE has utilized a system of priorities for projects based on the number of eligible children and the estimated number who are "unhoused." The "unhoused" are defined as the number above the normal capacity of the minimum school facilities.

All grants are made to qualified school districts on the basis of applications. The amount of payment to the LEA varies according to the section under which an applicant applies. Under Section 5, payment varies between 45% and 95% of actual per pupil construction costs depending on whether eligibility stemmed from "A" or "B" pupils.* Sections 9 and 10 provide for total payment of school construction costs for those pupils who are eligible to be counted for payment and who are also unhoused. In Section 14, Federal grants to provide needed minimum school facilities for children residing on Indian lands varies according to the ratio of eligible Indian pupils to the total number of pupils or the ratio of the Indian land to the total land area of the school district. Section 14 also provides that the P. L. 815 grant be made only after local, State and other Federal funds available are taken into account. Section 16 also requires that the Federal share be a residual payment after all other sources of aid have been utilized.

Program Effectiveness:

An evaluation of P. L. 81-815 was contained in the study by the Battelle Memorial Institute. The study concluded that with its system of project by project approval the administration of P. L. 815 is unnecessarily complicated. Furthermore, "because capital projects are easily deferrable in the Federal budget, P. L. 815 provides for uncertain levels of support based upon a priority system that tends to penalize a district that proceeds on its own to provide classrooms for Federally connected students."

Under P. L. 815, an eligible district which applies for Federal funds must show an increase in school membership over a 4-year period prior to receiving a project approval, under conditions of full funding. In periods of partial funding (as in the present), a school district is obliged to wait almost indefinitely for program aid.

As presently worded, P. L. 81-815 makes no provision for the depreciation of schools built with Federal funds. The law is concerned with increases in Federally connected children. Should the number of Federally connected children become stable in the long run and should facilities initially provided under P. L. 81-815 become obsolete, then replacement costs woud have to be borne solely by the school district.

In its study of S.A.F.A., Battelle recommended that the capital cost program (P. L. 815) applicable to the usual situations be merged with the operating cost program (P. L. 874) in order to simplify its administration. Under the Revenue Sharing Proposals of 1971 S.A.F.A. money could be used for either current or capital operations.

---

*See School Assistance for Federally Affected Areas Maintenance and Operations, for an explanation of "A" and "B" pupils.

Since 1966, the number of classrooms provided pupils housed is as follows: (Note: Due to legislative and administrative obligation and expenditure controls these figures cannot be related to Fiscal Year appropriations)

Section and fiscal year	Classrooms provided	Pupils housed
Sections 5, 8, 9		
1970	7,901	201,770
1969	2,416	98,390
1968	903	27,218
1967	1,100	33,355
1966	1,630	47,405
Section 14		
1970	--	--
1969	21	566
1968	21	690
1967	16	435
1966	87	2,600
Section 10		
1970	37	746
1969	137	3,704
1968	38	813
1967	100	2,440
1966	191	5,486

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Battelle Memorial Institute, School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: A Study of Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815, published by the Committee on Education and Labor, H.R. 91st Congress, 2nd Session, GPO, 1970.

2. Administration of Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815. Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Title IV, Equal Educational Opportunities

Legislation:

Expiration Date:

Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
(P. L. 88-352)

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965		$5,942,000
1966		6,206,000
1967		6,578,000
1968		8,468,000
1969		10,750,000
1970		19,000,000
1971		19,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Title IV is designed to provide assistance with problems occasioned by school desegregation. Section 403 of the act provide for technical assistance to any governmental unit legally responsible for operating a public school or schools upon submission of application to the Commissioner of Education. Section 404 authorizes the Commissioner to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation of short-term or regular session institutes for special training designed to improve the ability of teachers, supervisors, counselors, and other elementary or secondary school personnel to deal effectively with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation. Section 405 of the act authorizes the Commissioner, upon application of a school board, to make grants to such board to pay, in whole or in part the cost of (a) inservice training for teachers and other school personnel, (b) employing specialists to advise in problems incident to desegregation, and (c) determining whether to make a grant, and in fixing the amount thereof and the terms and conditions or which it will be made.

On November 17, 1967, the Division of Equal Educational Opportunities was established in the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, U. S. Office of Education to carry out the provisions of Title IV. The program was administered in fiscal 1970 by approximately 94 professional staff in Washington and in the regional offices of HEW. Fifteen universities in 14 southern states now operate desegregation assistance centers. Centers at the University of California at Los Angeles and at Teachers College Columbia University were also formed. Twenty-five state departments of education received Title IV funds for 1970-71.

Program Effectiveness:

The effectiveness of Title IV (P. L. 88-352) could not be ascertained from the reports submitted. The program does not lend itself to quantitative measures of effectiveness, therefore only qualitative statements are recorded, some having differing opinions. The most significant of these involves the role of Title IV University Desegregation Centers. A report filed by the Washington Research Project, an independent non-government agency, revealed their findings which concluded that the performance of the centers was uneven; they operate in isolation in that they have no viable relationship with other federal programs, regionals labs, the Office of Civil Rights or State Advisory Committees. In general they do not consult with groups dealing with school desegregation litigation. The report found a lack of leadership by the Office of Education in setting standards and initiating communication among the centers. It further found that the Centers were "unable to resolve what they perceive to be conflicting roles--that of desegregation plan development and provisions of educational services, and have never carried on both roles creatively." The U. S. Office of Education responded to the report of the Washington Research Project and pointed out that U.S.O.E. provides flexibility to the local school districts and does not impose a national operating procedure on universities or on local school districts; that the university centers do not operate in isolation in that they have on-going relationships with the Office of the Chief State School Officers, Federal and State Programs; the Office of Civil Rights, and local school districts. Further, the U.S.O.E. report stated that it has exerted leadership in setting standards and initiating communication among the Centers, which have a realistic definition of their roles.

The comments of the Washington Research Project were supported in an independent report prepared by the Race Relations Information Center of Nashville, Tennessee. One significant conclusion in this report was that in some cases Title IV was being used as a means of evading desegregation, or stalling for more time. A convergence of these different opinions has not been recorded and the effectiveness of the Centers are still in question.

There seems to be a general agreement that the coordination and administration of Title IV activities need considerable improvement before definitive accomplishments can be determined or realized.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The annual report of the FY 1972 Title IV program is in its final states of development. Annual reports are required for the Title IV Programs.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. DHEW, Civil Right Educational Activities, Annual Report FY 1972 (final draft)
2. DHEW, Equal Educational Opportunities, Annual Report FY 1969.
3. Race Relations Information Center, Nashville, Tennessee, Title IV of the 1964 Civil Rights Act: A Program In Search of a Policy, March, 1970.
4. Washington Research Project, "University Title IV Centers," 1971 (Unpublished).
5. DHEW, "Review of the Set of Findings Developed by the Education Coalition Concerning the Programs and Operations of the University Title IV Centers," (Unpublished), 1971.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP)

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Public Law 91-380 Continuing Resolution 92-38	Continuing Resolution expires February 22, 1972

President Nixon proposed the $1.5 billion Emergency School Aid Act of 1970 on May 21, 1970, to meet special needs of desegregating school districts. Pending Congressional approval of that Act, on August 18, 1970 Congress appropriated $75 million, as a short term emergency measure to meet such needs, and thus established ESAP. The ESAP appropriation was based on six legislative authorities:

(1) The Education Professions Development Act, Part D.
(2) The Cooperative Research Act.
(3) The Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV.
(4) The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Section 807.
(5) The Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, Section 402.
(6) The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Title II.

While Congressional approval of the Emergency School Aid Act was still pending the ESAP program was extended by Continuing Resolution to assist local education agencies and community groups for the 1971-72 school year.

Funding History:	Fiscal Year	Appropriation
	1971	$75,000,000
	1972	$75,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The general purpose of the ESAP program is stated in the ESAP regulations to be to:

> Meet special needs . . . . incident to the elimination of racial segregation and discrimination among students and faculty in elementary and secondary schools by contributing to the costs of new or expanded activities . . . designed to achieve successful desegregation and the elimination of all forms of discrimination in the schools on the basis of students or faculty being members of a minority group.

The Emergency School Assistance Program I (fiscal year 1971) and II (fiscal year 1972) were designed to meet the special needs of school districts which arose as a result of desegregation either under court order or voluntary plans filed under authority of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VI. The purpose of ESAP is to assist all eligible school districts to eliminate racially isolated schools; to provide financial assistance for the establishment of stable, quality integrated schools; to eliminate minority group isolation within the school districts; and to aid children in overcoming educational disadvantages occasioned by minority group isolation within the district.

ESAP Assistance can be used to support a range of LEA operational costs. To achieve the program's purpose and objectives there are five activities to help with problems relating to desegregation funded under this appropriation. These are: (1) special community programs; (2) special pupil personnel services; (3) special curriculum revision programs and teacher preparation programs; (4) special student to student activities; and (5) special comprehensive planning.

Regional HEW personnel are responsible for pre- and post grant review of grant application and grantee activities. Regional OE personnel review the program content of applications, and monitor the program operations, providing technical assistance where needed. Regional personnel for the Office of Civil Rights are responsible for determinations of eligibility of applicants, and monitoring of a grantee's compliance with the civil-rights related assurances which are contained in the grant application as required by the ESAP regulations. Both OE and OCR monitoring are achieved by means of reports required of grantees and by site visits performed by staff members. Where OE review indicates noncompliance with ESAP regulations efforts are first made to achieve voluntary compliance. Where voluntary compliance is not possible the information is referred to the Office of the General Counsel for termination action.

During the period of August to November 1970, 900 ESAP-I grants were made to Local Education Agencies for a total of $63,325,000. During the period of August to November 1971, 452 grants were made to LEAs for a total of $63,975,398.

Under ESAP I, a school district was eligible for financial assistance if (1) it was desegregating its schools under a final State or Federal court order or under a voluntary plan approved by HEW as meeting the nondiscrimination requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and (2) it commenced the terminal phase of such plan or court order by the opening of the 1970-71 academic year or had commenced such terminal phase during the 1968-69 or 1969-70 academic year. The regulations defined terminal phase as that phase of a desegregation plan at which the school district begins operating a unitary school system--one within which no person is effectively excluded from any school because of race or color.

ESAP II, while still directed towards districts with special needs incident to desegregation, focused on districts which were moving most effectively in desegregating their schools while maintaining quality educational programs.

Application evaluation procedures for ESAP II required much more intensive review of districts' compliance with ESAP regulations than was the case in ESAP I. The funding of grants under ESAP I was administered under a decision to allocate the funds as quickly as possible to desegregating school districts. By emphasizing speed, a degree of control, thoroughness, and accuracy was sacrificed. Program planning by LEAs was still a problem under ESAP II because of late authorization and appropriation of funds. However, administrative processes and procedures in allocating funds under ESAP II were improved over ESAP I management procedures. To assure effective distribution of funds, applicant districts were grouped into three priority categories and funded in five batches. Furthermore, each application was qualitatively rated on four desegregation criteria and qualitatively rated by a panel of educational experts on three program criteria. Improvement of assistance to districts coupled with these refinements of the application evaluation process was intended to produce programs of a higher quality than the previous year.

The community grant phase of Emergency School Assistance is designed to provide direct assistance to public and private nonprofit groups whose programs support and assist the desegregation activities carried on within the Local Education Agency. Under Emergency School Assistance Program I, $7,372,000 were allocated to 156 grant applicants. The activities in this program ranged from educational television to highly intensified tutoring and remedial programs. They included student operated projects, and many community human relations programs. Under Emergency School Assistance Program II $6,782,968 were allotted to 143 grantees. As in the case of LEA grants, a rating system employing both quantitative categories and qualitative judgments was designed to enable all projects to be ranked according to an overall rating scheme.

Program Effectiveness of ESAP-I

A detailed study of ESAP-I school district grants was conducted under contract to OE by RMC, Inc. RMC randomly selected 252 ESAP-I districts in fourteen southern States for a detailed analysis and evaluation. These districts enroll 51 percent of the minority students in districts funded by the ESAP program and 28 percent of all minority students in the fourteen States.

Program statistics show that in all ESAP-I districts 2,260,000 students were reassigned to desegregated schools out of 7,170,000 total students enrolled. The RMC results show that the amount of racial change from the 1969-70 to the 1970-71 school years in individual schools receiving ESAP services varied widely:

Amount of Racial Change[2]	Estimated Percent of all ESAP Schools
More integrated	
Substantial change (More than 5 percentage points)	46
Small change (5 percentage points or less)	15
No change	27
Became more segregated	13

In March-April 1971, over 9,000 ESAP Project Directors, principals, teachers and students in 879 schools were interviewed about changes in the racial climate in their schools since the school year began in Fall 1970. Student responses to a large number of questions suggest that school desegregation during the 1970-71 school year was not as turbulent as frequently portrayed. Fully 41 percent of students attending desegregated schools for the first time reported changes for the better during the year as far as "going to school with students of another race." Most of the remainder had not changed their views and less than 5 percent felt worse. Eighty percent of all students interviewed agree that "students are cooperating more and more as the year goes on." While a minority of the students still felt somewhat ambivalent about their school, 80 percent of both races reported learning more in school than the previous year.

[2] The most frequent ways schools became more segregated was for 1969-70 majority white schools to gain more whites in 1970-71 or for 1969-70 majority black schools to gain more blacks in 1970-71. Some schools became more segregated by becoming more identifiable as a black school in 1970-71 than they had been identifiable as a white school the previous year (for example, a 75 percent black school in 1970-71 that had been a 65 percent white school in 1969-70). (The reverse case, a school becoming more identifiable as a white in 1970-71 than it had been as a black school the previous year, occurred in only two schools visited by RMC.)

Other schools either showed no change from 1969-70 to 1970-71 or became more integrated. More integrated schools have been divided into two groups: (1) those showing only 1-5 percentage points change (e.g., a 65 percent white school becoming a 61 percent white school or a 74 black school becoming a 71 percent black school) and (2) those showing more than 5 percentage points change (e.g., an all black school becoming a 90 percent black school or an 80 percent white school becoming a 50 percent white school).

ESAP Project Directors, principals and teachers were asked about 12 specific areas of possible change in the school racial climate since the start of the school year, including those listed in the table below:

	Percent of Teachers Perceiving Situation as:			
Area of Possible Change	Better	No change	Worse	Total
(1) Number of interracial friendships	63	36	1	100%
(2) Students of different races working together in the classrooms	51	47	2	100%
(3) Teachers of different races relate to each other	34	63	3	100%
(4) Student groupings on the campus and cafeteria	32	66	2	100%
(5) Attendance of black students	19	75	6	100%

Perhaps the most significant finding is that the vast majority of respondents found that the racial climate had changed for the better or had not changed. On most items, only from 1 to 3 percent of the teachers felt that the situation had worsened during the year. Principals were significantly more positive than teachers (their "percent better" responses on the above items are 78, 64, 51, 38, and 33 respectively).

To conclude with any confidence that actual changes in, for example, the number of interracial friendships in the school had truly occurred, one would expect that the teachers in the school would tend to agree. Measures of racial climate change were examined in 200 schools and the five measures listed above were found to have high levels of agreement within the schools. Thus, these measures are statistically justified as reliable indicators of actual changes in the racial climate of schools.

Did ESAP contribute to improvements in the racial climate of schools? The relationship between the presence of various ESAP activities in the 879 schools visited and positive changes in the five measures of racial climate was examined. The presence of certain ESAP activities was significantly associated with positive racial change. Schools with ESAP counselors, for example, showed more positive racial change than schools that did not have ESAP counselors. Based on this and other statistical analyses, RMC concluded that the following ESAP activities are effective:

(1) Counseling
(2) Counseling support
(3) Student programs
(4) Remedial programs

The analyses also show that teacher training activities are not effective. Racial climate measures showed more improvement in schools that do not have ESAP teacher training than in schools that do. Twelve other ESAP activities appear to be neutral--their presence in a school makes it neither more nor less likely that the racial climate in the school will improve.[1]

The above findings were confirmed in analysis of intensity effects and duration effects. Higher ESAP expenditures per student spent on counseling programs were associated with more positive racial change than lower expenditures. Also, higher intensity of expenditures for teacher training was associated with stronger negative effects. That is, not only is teacher training ineffective but the greater the expenditures for teacher training the worse the results. The more effective activities (counseling, counseling support, student programs, and remedial programs) gained effectiveness the longer they had been implemented.

Data on changes the districts made in their ESAP projects during the school year shows a tendency to include more of the activities found effective by this study. However, the four effective activities constitute only 23 percent of all ESAP activities. Counseling activities were relatively infrequent. Student programs and counseling support activities are particularly attractive because of their low relative cost (average grant sizes of $8,000 and $14,000 respectively compared with an average of $19,000 for all activities). On the other hand, teacher training was one of the most frequent activities chosen and is well above average in cost ($24,000). An estimated 12 percent of ESAP funds went to support teacher training activities. Two neutral activities - teacher aides and non-ethnic classes and materials - were more widely chosen than all four effective programs combined and more money was spent on teacher aides alone than all four effective programs. However, the possible value of both teacher aides and non-ethnic classes and materials in improving academic achievement was not examined in this evaluation.

An overall assessment of ESAP is difficult to make because of the absence of control groups in this study (i.e., all LEAs and all schools visited had at least some ESAP activities). The aggregate effect of ESAP was slightly positive when comparisons were made of racial climate changes in ESAP schools having a specific ESAP activity with those not having that activity, but its small size prevented strong effectiveness claims from being made. In addition, when respondents were asked to cite reasons for improvements in the racial climate, ESAP was rarely cited. It should be recognized that the expectations for ESAP impact on outcomes was an open question because of the short time its activities had been in effect and the small amount of funds provided relative to the school districts' total budgets.

1/ The other 12 ESAP-I activities were: personal community activities, non-personal community activities, ethnic classes and materials, non-ethnic classes and materials, teacher aides and other support personnel, busing, remedial education personnel, comprehensive planning, administrative personnel, materials, facilities improvement and all others.

Intensive case studies of 20 selected ESAP districts were also conducted.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) reviewed the policies and procedures of DHEW for approving ESAP-I grants and reviewed expenditures at a sample of districts. GAO published in March 1971 its conclusions about DHEW procedures. GAO concluded that HEW regional offices did not obtain sufficient information from the districts nor have sufficient time to make a "proper determination that the grants were made in accordance with program regulations or that the grants were in line with the purpose of the program." It also stated that "most of the applications did not contain, contrary to the regulations, adequate descriptions of the methods, procedures, or objective criteria that could be used by an independent organization to evaluate the effectiveness of each project." GAO also expressed concern about compliance of some districts with ESAP and Title VI regulations.

A GAO study of 28 school districts receiving ESAP-I funds was published on September 29, 1971. This report concluded that 24 of the 28 districts were eligible for ESAP. Title VI compliance questions were unresolved in three cases and one LEA was not in its final phase of desegregation as required in the eligibility guidelines. "Generally the districts' activities were directed toward meeting special needs associated with achieving and maintaining a desegregated school system. Some activities, however, appeared to be directed more toward aiding education in general..." GAO found that most districts had not fully complied with at least one of the required assurances or with certain regulations although school district and HEW officials generally indicated that corrective action would be taken. Delays in project implementation and examples of poor project implementation were also reported.

Weaknesses in project implementation were attributed by GAO to the need for speed and the lack of an effective HEW regional office monitoring system. (The RMC report found that technical assistance from the Office of Education was little used but was generally rated as effective by ESAP Project Directors. Only 23 percent of the projects had received technical assistance. ESAP-I Project Directors rated OE much more effective in swift processing of applications than in providing technical assistance in later planning and operation.)

A private, foundation-supported evaluation was conducted in November and December 1970 by six civil rights organizations under the coordination of the Washington Research Project. The combined field staff visited nearly 300 ESAP-I grantees and examined a large number of approved ESAP applications. They concluded there was serious defects in the administration of the program. Most of their criticisms centered upon ESAP-I projects not directly attacking desegregation emergencies and instead being used for general aid to education. They also felt that a large number of grants went to districts still practicing racial discrimination or to support projects which were racist in nature. This evaluation study did not investigate effectiveness of operating projects upon students or teachers.

The Office of Education made a detailed response to Congress concerning the Washington Research Project report. The response detailed information concerning school districts mentioned in the report and concluded that in most cases the allegations of the WRP were not supported by evidence upon which OE would be able to act. Where violations of the ESAP regulations were noted corrective action was required or enforcement action was taken by the Office of the General Counsel.

Seventy termination actions were initiated by the Office of the General Counsel for the ESAP I program. In 32 cases compliance was achieved without the need for administrative hearing. Thirty-eight termination hearings were conducted. In 2 cases compliance was achieved after hearing, and in 2 cases the OGC dismissed the proceeding after hearing. Termination was ordered in 15 cases and denied in 18. Appeals were taken in 8 cases.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

1. Evaluation of ESAP-I Community Grants Program being conducted by Kirschner Associates, Inc.

2. Evaluation of ESAP-II School District Program - being conducted by the National Opinion Research Center.

3. Evaluation of ESAP-II Community Grants Program - being conducted by Contemporary Research, Inc.

Source of Evaluation Data:

1. Evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program, Resource Management Corporation, Bethesda, Maryland, 1971.

2. Need to Improve Policies and Procedures for approving grants under the Emergency School Assistance, General Accounting Office, 1971.

3. Weaknesses in School Districts' Implementation of the Emergency School Assistance Program, General Accounting Office, 1971.

4. The Emergency School Assistance Program: An Evaluation, prepared by Washington Research Project and five other civil rights organizations, 1970.

5. Surveys of HEW Office of Civil Rights (Surveys of ESAP and other LEA's to determine numbers of minority students and teachers).

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS AND EFFECTIVENESS INFORMATION

B. EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Page

1. State Grant Program 72
2. Regional Resource Centers 74
3. Deaf/Blind Centers 76
4. Early Childhood Education 78
5. Teacher Education 80
6. Recruitment and Information 83
7. Physical Education and Recreation-Training 85
8. Research, Innovation and Demonstration 87
9. Physical Education and Recreation-Research 89
10. Media Services and Captioned Films 91
11. Specific Learning Disabilities 94

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

State Grant Program

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part B - Assistance to States for Education of Handicapped Children

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965		
	1966		
	1967	$ 51,500,000	$ 2,475,000
	1968	154,500,000	15,000,000
	1969	167,375,000	29,250,000
	1970	206,000,000	29,190,000
	1971	206,000,000	34,000,000
	1972	216,300,000	35,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Non-matching grants to the States are made to assist in the initiation, expansion, and improvement of education of handicapped children at the pre-school, elementary, and secondary levels.

Seven million children (one million of pre-school age) are handicapped by mental retardation, speech problems, emotional disorders, deafness, blindness, crippling conditions or other health impairments that will cause school failure, emotional problems and retarded development unless special educational procedures are available to them. At present, only 40% of school-age handicapped children are receiving special education, and in some States only 10-15% of the children are receiving this help. Approximately one million of these unserved children do not participate in any educational program.

The Federal strategy for the development of the program has been to serve as a catalyst to local and State program growth rather than providing full Federal support for a limited number of children. Joint planning with the States has led to increased programming for children on a comprehensive basis involving various Federal programs and local resources, e.g., Elementary and Secondary Education, Titles I and III Vocational Education, etc.

Program Effectiveness:

The effectiveness of this program has been demonstrated primarily by its increased outreach, i.e., the increased numbers of projects receiving Federal support, and by its development and technical assistance to the States.

In 1971, approximately 400 new programs were begun with Title VI-B funds, and 700 other projects were continued from the previous year. The 1,100 projects provided services to approximately 183,000 children (see Source 1 below). Due to increases in funding from Federal, State, and local sources, services have been provided to an additional 125,000 children per year for the last three years.

A study of three States in 1970 (see Source 2 below) indicated that State personnel responsible for administering Title VI-B funds have a positive view of the program and its catalytic strategy. However, it was also discovered that there was substantial variation among the States in the capability and comprehensiveness of State planning for use of these funds. One product of this study was a manual describing techniques for establishing a planning and evaluation function in State agencies. In view of the needs demonstrated in these three States and anecdotal evidence of similar need in other States, a technical assistance program involving 25 States in planning workshops was implemented in 1971. A similar program is scheduled for the remainder of the States in 1972.

The Federal Assistance Streamlining Task Force (FAST) reviewed the administrative procedures of the program in 1971 (see Source 3). In general, the review was positive; in particular, FAST cited the effectiveness of the planning format developed for joint State-Federal planning.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation of the impact of this program is currently underway in a representative sample of 40 States and approximately 550 local school districts. This study is intended to determine (a) current impact and (b) methods, if any, of increasing impact. The study will be completed on June 30, 1972 (Source 4).

Source of Evaluation Data:

1. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

2. Evaluation of State Administered Programs for the Handicapped by the Organization for Social and Technical Innovation, Inc.

3. Report of the Federal Assistance Streamlining Task Force, dated March, 1971.

4. Evaluation of an Aid-to-States Program for Education of Handicapped Children by Exotech Systems, Inc.

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Regional Resource Centers

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part C - Centers and Services to Meet Special Needs of the Handicapped, Sec. 621

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968	$7,750,000	
	1969	7,750,000	$ 500,000
	1970	10,000,000	1,800,000
	1971*		3,550,000
	1972*		3,550,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides authority for grants and contracts to institutions of higher education or State educational agencies to establish and operate regional centers to develop and apply methods of determining the special needs of children and to provide services to meet those needs. The regional resource centers function to meet the requirements of the teacher serving the handicapped child. The objective is to provide every teacher serving the handicapped children with the necessary assistance and resources. One of the major problems inhibiting the education of the handicapped child has been the lack of good diagnostic tools and instructional resources. The classroom teacher of the handicapped child, because of a lack of supportive resources, has had to be her own diagnostician, curriculum development specialist, educational evaluator, and media specialist. Professional services to accomplish these tasks are needed. The regional resource center concept is an attempt to meet this need.

---

* Total of $36,500,000 in 1971 and $51,500,000 in 1972 is authorized for Part C, EHA, which includes early childhood projects, regional resource centers, and deaf-blind centers.

Program Effectiveness:

This program has not been operative long enough to determine if the various strategies being utilized are effective. The first year for which funds were appropriated, FY 1969, was primarily a planning year. In FY 1971, four existing and two new centers were funded. The following are examples of the kinds of activities initiated by the various centers:

a. Trained personnel began to move into schools on a trial basis to provide guidance and assistance to teachers;

b. In the Southeastern States, a consortium of centers was designed which capitalizes on existing resources in each of the States but provides services across State lines;

c. Seven summer workshops were conducted in a ten-State area to provide teachers with more appropriate approaches to education;

d. Center personnel focused efforts on inner-city, rural, and geographically isolated areas.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation study is tentatively scheduled for FY 1974, at which time the program should be in operation long enough to have had impact.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Deaf/Blind Centers

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part C - Centers and Services to Meet Special Needs of the Handicapped, Sec. 622

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History:

Year:	Authorization:	Appropriation:
1965		
1966		
1967		
1968	$3,000,000	
1969	3,000,000	$1,000,000
1970	7,000,000	2,000,000
1971*		4,500,000
1972*		5,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides for grants or contracts to establish and operate centers for deaf-blind children, and to develop and apply with these children specialized, intensive services. Such services should enable them to achieve their full potential for communication, adjustment to and participation in society, and self-fulfillment.

Program Effectiveness:

Prior to the 1964-65 rubella epidemic, an estimated 600 deaf-blind children were known to exist in the United States. Only about 100 of these children were enrolled in educational programs at that time. The National Center for Disease Control estimates that, as a result of the epidemic, there are now more than 4,000 deaf-blind children. Since the inception of this program, over 3,500 of these children have been located and identified through regional deaf-blind centers. In addition, the ten centers supported by the program in FY 1971 are providing services to 1,615 children and their parents.

---

*Total of $36,500,000 in 1971 and $51,500,000 in 1972 is authorized for Part C, EHA, which includes early childhood projects, regional resource centers, and deaf-blind centers.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

A formal evaluation of this program will probably be done in FY 1973 or FY 1974, depending on the availability of funds.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Early Childhood Education

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part C - Centers and Services to Meet Special Needs of the Handicapped, Section 623

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History:

Year:	Authorization:	Appropriation:
1965		
1966		
1967		
1968		
1969	$1,000,000	$ 945,000
1970	10,000,000	3,000,000
1971*		7,000,000
1972*		7,500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides grants and contracts on a matching basis to stimulate the development of comprehensive educational services for young (0-8 years) handicapped children with a primary focus on the preschool age level (0-5) years. The objective is to encourage growth of early childhood services for all pre-school aged handicapped children in Federal, State, and local educational and day care programs to prevent and reduce the debilitating effects of a handicap upon children in the United States who suffer from a handicapping condition. Between 50% and 75% of these children fall into the categories of mild retardation, emotional disturbance, and of specific learning disabilities. Research findings indicate that many of these children, with early childhood programming, would have an excellent chance of overcoming their handicaps by developing compensatory skills so that they can attend regular classes. The alternative to early education is usually attendance in special classes for the handicapped which are expensive and may be too late to help a child develop his potential.

---

*Total of $36,500,000 in 1971 and $51,500,000 in 1972 is authorized for Part C, EHA, which includes early childhood projects, regional resource centers, and deaf-blind centers.

Community services available for education of the preschool handicapped are very limited. The majority of the programs in existence operate on a tuition basis, making their services unavailable to children of low income families. Even in publicly supported programs children have a difficult time gaining admission. Federal support, leadership, and demonstration funds are designed to influence States and local school districts throughout the country to initiate and maintain public programs in preschool and early education.

Program Effectiveness:

Existing information (source 1) about this program indicates that it has been effective in accomplishing program goals. Because of the newness of this program (the first projects were begun in FY 1969), no rigorous evaluation of its impact -- particularly impact in terms of improvement in children -- has been possible.

Each year 20-25 new projects have been added. In FY 1971, 41 continuing projects and 23 new projects were funded. This resulted in services being provided to approximately 2,000 children and 4,000 parents. In addition, about 3,300 professional and paraprofessional personnel received inservice training in these projects. Strategies to increase the outreach of this program have included the following:

a. Users of ESEA Title III and EHA Title VI, Part B, funds have been encouraged to develop early childhood projects. It is estimated that an additional 400 projects serving approximately 20,000 children have been supported under these titles;

b. A manual on identification, referral, and treatment of handicapped children in regular day care centers is being prepared jointly by the Office of Education and the Office of Child Development;

c. A Leadership Training Institute was developed to provide assistance to operating projects, State Education Agencies, and others interested in developing educational services for preschool, handicapped children.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

A descriptive, "soft" evaluation study of the 22 first-year projects is now in progress and will be completed by June 30, 1972 (source 2). The objective of this study is to provide information useful for future planning and more efficient program management. A rigorous evaluation study is scheduled for FY 1973.

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Teacher Education

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part D - Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped, Sec. 631-2

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	$14,500,000	$14,500,000
	1966	19,500,000	19,500,000
	1967	29,500,000	24,500,000
	1968	34,000,000	24,500,000
	1969	37,500,000	29,700,000
	1970	55,000,000	29,700,000
	1971*		31,900,000
	1972*		33,945,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides for grants to institutions of higher education, State education agencies, and other non-profit agencies to prepare teachers, teacher educators, researchers, speech correctionists and other special service personnel to educate the handicapped. To extend quality educational service to all handicapped children under current teacher-student ratios and current patterns of instructional organization will require an additional 245,000 teachers for school age children and 60,000 for preschool children. Upgrading and updating the 125,000 special education teachers currently employed, of whom nearly one-half are uncertified, is also necessary.

This program attacks the problem by use of Federal grants to increase the number of teachers trained, by development of new models for improved effectiveness, and by targeting resources on crucial areas of need.

Program Effectiveness:

This program has been found to be effective. The various recipients of support have indicated that grants from this program have (a) resulted in stronger training programs, (b) been an important contributor to the multiplication of training programs, and (c) had a significant role in assisting students to finish their training.

---

* A total of $69,500,000 in 1971 and $87,000,000 in 1972 is authorized for Part D, EHA.

Training support was provided to 304 institutions of higher education and all State Education Agencies (SEAs). Direct support to individuals through these two channels was as follows:

Types of support	Number of persons
Undergraduate traineeships	1,783
Master's Fellowships	2,249
Postmaster's Fellowships	565
Summer Trainees (SEA program)	5,727
Institute Trainees (SEA program)	11,850

In addition, 35 Special Project grants were awarded for development of improved curricula and methods of teacher education (Source 1).

An evaluation study found that the support to institutions provided by this program has been responsible for the development of training programs where none existed, the improvement of existing programs and increased output of teachers and leadership personnel (Source 2). An earlier study also found that the increase of enrollment in training programs for the period 1953-54 to 1961-62 (prior to implementation of Federal legislation creating this program) was 292 per cent but was 370 per cent between 1961-62 and 1968-69 (Source 3).

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation study is in progress and is to be completed by June 30, 1972. This study will develop further information about the impact of current strategies and will identify alternative strategies which might increase the rate at which Special Education teachers are trained.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

2. Study of the Need for Educational Manpower for Handicapped Children by Operation Research, In., 1970.

3. Students in Training Programs in the Education of Handicapped Children and Youth 1968-69, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S.O.E.

4. An Evaluation of Federal Programs to Increase the Pool of Special Education Teachers, by RMC, Inc., in progress.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

2. Evaluation of Early Education Programs by the Teaching Research Division, Oregon State System of Higher Education, Monmouth, Oregon.

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Recruitment and Information

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part D - Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped, Section 633

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History:

Year	Authorization:	Appropriation:
1965		$
1966		
1967		
1968	$1,000,000	
1969	1,000,000	250,000
1970	1,000,000	475,000
1971*		500,000
1972*		500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The program provides non-matching grants or contracts to conduct projects to interest people in entering the career field of special education, and to disseminate information and provide referral services. Great numbers of parents of handicapped children have no information about where to turn for help in educating their children. In addition, an estimated 250,000 teachers are necessary to augment the special education manpower supply. This program is designed to provide an appropriate information and referral service for parents and their handicapped children in order that they may be assisted in their attempts to gain an equal educational opportunity.

Program Effectiveness:

Program personnel indicate that the recruitment component of this program is considered satisfactory by representatives of many of the institutions which disseminate recruitment information. The high number of requests for referral information from parents and professionals indicates that the information component of the program is meeting a need.

---

* A total of $69,500,000 in 1971 and $87,000,000 in 1972 were authorized for Part D, EHA.

Data on actual response to the recruitment aspect of this program is not being collected due to the prohibitive expense involved. Materials are provided primarily to training institutions, i.e., colleges and universities, and dissemination to potential recruits is done by personnel from these institutions.

In FY 1971, there were 36,000 requests from parents and professionals for information on the availability of educational services for handicapped children. No evaluation has been done on the degree to which provision of this information leads to actual services for children.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No evaluation study of this program is planned due to the prohibitive cost of such a study relative to the total program expenditures.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Physical Education and Recreation - Training

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part D - Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped, Sec. 634

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968	$1,000,000	
	1969	2,000,000	$ 300,000
	1970	2,000,000	300,000
	1971*		700,000
	1972*		700,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides for grants to institutions of higher education to prepare physical education and recreation teachers, teacher educators, supervisors and researchers in physical education and recreation for the handicapped.

The special limitations of the handicapped seriously restrict their opportunities for physical education and recreation. Physical Education and Recreation programs require modification for these children and specialists must be educated to develop and implement such modifications. In only a few instances are cities or schools currently able to provide appropriate physical education and recreation activities for the handicapped.

Program Effectiveness:

At this time, an assessment of the impact of this program is not practical because of its limited scope and its recent origins.

---

* A total of $69,500,000 in 1971 and $87,000,000 in 1972 has been authorized for Part D, EHA.

Thirty-one projects involving 280 trainees were funded in FY 1971. Eighty specialists graduated from supported programs while 150 physical education and recreation personnel received training in short courses dealing with the unique problems of handicapped children.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No evaluation of this program is planned at this time.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Edcuation for the Handicapped

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Research, Innovation and Demonstration

Legislation:

P.L. 71-230, Title VI, Part E - Research in the Education of the Handicapped, Sec. 641

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	$2,000,000	$2,000,000
	1966	6,000,000	8,000,000
	1967	9,000,000	8,100,000
	1968	12,000,000	11,100,000
	1969	14,000,000	12,800,000
	1970	18,000,000	12,060,000
	1971*		15,000,000
	1972*		15,455,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the research, innovation, and demonstration program is to improve educational opportunities for handicapped children. More specifically, the program's purposes are to:

a. identify, refine, demonstrate, and put into appropriate hands, solutions to specific identified problems concerning education of the handicapped; and

b. develop, demonstrate, and disseminate innovative support systems and techniques to improve the performance of teachers and other practitioners, serving the handicapped.

Program Effectiveness:

This program has supported a variety of research projects which have led to improvement and/or innovation in (a) teaching methods, (b) curriculum development, and (c) development of "hardware" and "software", e.g., computer assisted instruction. Developments in each of these areas have, of course, immediate, practical importance for handicapped children.

---

* A total of $27,000,000 in 1971 and $35,500,000 in 1972 has been authorized for Part E, EHA

In FY 1971, 26 new individual projects and 38 continuing projects were funded under this program. The average size of grants for new projects was approximately $93,000 while the average for continuing projects was about $179,000. In addition to individual projects, five Research and Development Centers are supported by this program at an average cost of approximately $355,000.(See Source 1).

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluative study of this program is in progress now. The objectives of this study are: (1) to determine the impact of program activities in terms of the degree to which these activities assist in the achievement of Federal objectives for education of the handicapped, and (2) to improve the management of this program. This study is due to be completed on June 30, 1972.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

2. Evaluation Methods and Results in Research and Development Efforts for Handicapped Children by U.R.S. Research Co., in progress.

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Physical Education and Recreation - Research

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part E - Research in the Education of the Handicapped, Sec. 642

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968	$1,000,000	
	1969	1,500,000	$ 300,000
	1970	1,500,000	300,000
	1971*		300,000
	1972*		300,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides support for research and related purposes relative to the needs and performance of handicapped children in the area of physical education and recreation.

Program Effectiveness:

This program, though limited in scope and of recent origin, has already demonstrated its usefulness. Some of the results of funded projects are as follows:

a. Guidelines for implementing a physical education program for seriously mentally retarded and multiply handicapped children have been developed;

b. A study has determined optimum physical education programming for emotionally disturbed, elementary school boys.

---

* Total of $27,000,000 in 1971 and $35,500,000 in 1972 is authorized for Part E, EHA which includes research and demonstration and physical education and recreation research.

Two new and two continuing projects were supported by this program in FY 1971. The average cost per project was about $75,000.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No studies of this program are currently planned.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Progam Name:

Media Services and Captioned Films

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part F - Instructional Media for the Handicapped, Sec. 652 and 653.

Expiration Date:

Indefinite

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965		$1,384,000
	1966		2,800,000
	1967	$3,000,000	2,800,000
	1968	8,000,000	2,800,000
	1969	8,000,000	4,750,000
	1970	10,000,000	4,750,000
	1971	12,500,000	6,000,000
	1972	15,000,000	6,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to make available to handicapped persons a portion of the entertainment and educational films, video tapes, records, etc. that are available to the general public and to develop appropriate educational technology for use by handicapped pupils and their teachers. The program is also concerned with the development and implementation of systems to assure that such materials become available for classroom use. Handicapped persons, their parents, potential employees, employers and other workers with the hanciapped are eligible to receive services from this program.

Today's educational systems depend heavily upon the use of educational media such as films, records, television, and other instructional materials. In such a school system, the handicapped child is doubly disadvantaged. In addition to being handicapped, the nature of a child's handicapping condition may limit his ability to use these materials.

The need to adapt educational materials for use by handicapped children is the basis of this program.

(a) the deaf need to have films and television adapted for their use by captioning.

(b) the blind continue to require talking books and other unique tactile materials in order to develop certain concepts.

(c) modified language programs are necessary for deaf children to acquire adequate language skills.

Even with these added services many techniques for gathering information are closed to the deaf, the blind and other handicapped children.

The needs are clear for the development of successful educational programs centered around the needs of the individual handicapped child. These children require unique educational experiences in order to enter into the community as contributing members.

Program Effectiveness:

This program has developed and disseminated a large number of products which have had immediate and practical use in the educational process. As the program has expanded, it has reached an increasingly large population with greater frequency.

During FY 1971, this program acquired the following: 67 16mm educational titles; 80 8mm cartridges, 120 35 mm filmstrips; 190 sets of transparencies; 27,000 training manuals and books; 56 16mm general interest films; 12 16mm teacher training films. The program retired 58 35mm filmstrips and 35 16mm general interest films.

Cultural films had a viewing audience of 1,250,000 while educational films had an audience of 1,200,000. The film series on driver education for the deaf won an award from the National Safety Council.

The Special Educational Instructional Materials Center program, developed under the research authority, was considered sufficienty developed to be transferred into an operational service program area.

Through the use of computer-based resource units, as developed and distributed through the Instructional Material Center program, 50,000 teachers of the handicapped have been provided with detailed curriculum planning aids.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation of this program is tentatively scheduled for FY 1974 or FY 1975.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Specific Learning Disabilities

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part G -
Special Programs for Children with
Specific Learning Disabilities

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968		
	1969		
	1970	$12,000,000	
	1971	20,000,000	$1,000,000
	1972	31,000,000	1,500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Prevalence estimates for children with specific learning disabilities, as noted in a 1969 report of the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped, include 1 to 3 percent of school age population (5-19 years), i.e., 600,000 to 1,800,000. Recognition of this handicap has been relatively recent and Federal activities are designed to help define the nature of the disorders and its treatment and to stimulate increased supply of teachers. In academic year 1968-69 there were 9,400 trained teachers serving children with specific learning disabilities and an estimated 25,000 additional teachers needed. Competitive grants are made to State Education Agencies to demonstrate effective programs for establishing and operating model centers for children with specific learning disabilities, and to establish program plans within States for meeting the educational requirements of these children.

Program Effectiveness:

In its first year of operation, FY 1971, this program funded nine new projects. The strategy for funding was to award grants to State Educational Agencies for the purpose of developing projects in conjunction with local public or private, non-profit educational organizations. In developing these projects, the State Educational Agencies are required to:

a. run a specific learning disabilities intervention program which could serve as a demonstration model;

b. evaluate the program according to its objectives and goals;

c. set up a process to determine the validity of that intervention model;

d. develop a plan for implementation of that model.

All of these projects are in the early developmental stage and the final form which each project will take is not yet apparent.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Because of the newness of this program, no evaluation studies are planned for the near future.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS AND EFFECTIVENESS INFORMATION

C. VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

Page
1. Vocational and Technical Education: Basic Grants to States.... 97
2. Vocational and Technical Education: Programs for Students with Special Needs..........107
3. Vocational and Technical Education: Research and Training.....110
4. Vocational and Technical Education: Exemplary Programs........114
5. Vocational and Technical Education: Consumer and Homemaking Education..........118
6. Vocational and Technical Education: Cooperative Education Programs..........121
7. Vocational and Technical Education: Work Study Programs.......125
8. Vocational and Technical Education: Curriculum Development....128
9. Adult Basic Education: Basic Grants to States................131
10. Adult Basic Education: Special Projects......................134
11. Adult Basic Education: Teacher Training......................137
12. Manpower Development and Training Programs...................140

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education - Basic Grants to States

Legislation:

Vocational Education Act of 1963 as amended 1968, Part B

Expiration Date:

Permanent

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	$156,641,000	$156,446,000*
	1966	209,741,000	209,741,000
	1967	252,491,000	248,216,000
	1968	252,491,000	249,300,000
	1969	314,500,000	248,216,000
	1970	503,500,000	300,336,000
	1971	602,500,000	315,302,000
	1972	602,500,000	376,682,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are made to the States to assist them in conducting vocational education programs for persons of all ages with the objective of insuring that education and training programs for career vocations are available to all individuals who desire and need such education and training for gainful employment. States are required to set aside 15 percent for vocational education for the disadvantaged; 15 percent for postsecondary programs; and 10 percent for vocational education for the handicapped. Funds may be used for the construction of vocational facilities. States are required to match one dollar for every Federal dollar.

Comprehensive career education is now being stressed involving the unification of the entire school system around the career development theme; featuring extensive community, industrial, and business involvement; making heavy use of cooperative education to equip all students for work or further education.

Program Effectiveness:

Generally, there is a lack of national data on placement and follow-up of vocational education students. Most of the surveys completed in recent years are regional or State studies; several examine outcomes of specific occupational programs.

---

*This does not include the permanent authorization and appropriation of $7.1 million apportioned to the States each year under the Smith Hughes Act.

Other data indicating the effectiveness of vocational education programs are limited and usually can be found only in the annual State reports and from State Advisory Council studies. Annual State reports contain enrollment and expenditure data for the most part with effectiveness information limited to the number of employed or pursuing additional education.

Although impact data is lacking, trend information indicates that vocational education programs are changing. Increased training for disadvantaged and handicapped students, growth in comprehensive programs, particularly a significant expansion of postsecondary programs and a dramatic increase in the number of new vocational education facilities are trends evident in summary data reflecting program changes in the years since 1965. These and other changes can be attributed to the impetus created by the vocational education legislation of the 1960's which clearly called for changes in program direction, expanded resources and the promotional program sponsored by the National Industrial Conference Board, the Advertising Council and the Office of Education emphasizing new careers.

Enrollment trends are cited below:

	1965	1971	1976*
Regular Participants:			
Secondary	2,819,000	2,958,000	5,927,000
Postsecondary	207,000	871,000	1,550,000
Adult	2,379,000	1,949,000	3,351,000
Disadvantaged:			
Secondary enrollees	NA	595,000	904,000
Postsecondary enrollees	NA	114,000	215,000
Adult enrollees	NA	102,000	316,000
Handicapped:			
Secondary enrollees	NA	127,000	306,000
Postsecondary enrollees	NA	75,000	89,000
Adult enrollees	NA	20,000	98,000
Total enrollment	5,431,000	6,811,000	10,828,000

Large enrollment increases occurred in selected occupations of critical importance to the national economy; i.e., public service, trades, office occupations, health occupations.

---

* Based on State reports (Estimates)

Occupation	1967	1971	Percent Increase by Level		
			Sec.	Postsec.	Adult
Engineering Related/Tech	5,200	16,800	25	50	25
Police Science Tech.	3,400	21,400	0	90	10
Fire and Safety Tech.	900	5,700	0	65	35
Const. and Maintenance	161,600	260,800	35	15	50
Health Assistants	22,800	53,500	30	15	55
Nurse, Assoc. Degree	9,600	27,500	0	90	10

Enrollments in secondary health careers education increased from 16,734 in 1967 to 31,915 in 1970. Change in offerings was a result of several pilot projects. Students were provided a broad introduction to health careers with exploratory work experiences in a wide range of jobs and guidance in choosing among options. On completion of high school, skills acquired enable students to take jobs or to continue their education.

Programs for medical and dental office assistants are increasing. For example, an additional year of training, beyond the basic programs for medical assistants, prepares a pediatric office assistant. Other specialists include orthopedic assistant, opthalmic assistant, dental assistant and hygienist. In these categories, completions totalled 4,207 in 1969 and 5,203 in 1970, an increase of 24 percent. Projected growth for 1972 shows an increase of 173 percent.

Manpower Shifts Parallel Changing Economy

Shifts in the number of vocational education teachers since 1965 have paralleled the manpower demands of the national economy. These changes are shown in the following table:

	1965	1970	Percent Change
Agriculture	17,608	12,420	-29
Distribution	7,200	10,458	45
Health	3,429	10,483	206
Office	15,850	45,081	184
Technical	9,213	14,241	55
Trades and Industry	39,804	56,720	84
Other 1/	488	6,736	277
Total (Unduplicated)	109,136	190,364	74

1/ Other includes occupational programs not elsewhere classified in 1965. In 1970 "other" also includes special programs teachers, i.e., exemplary; prevocational, postsecondary and remedial.

To meet health service shortages throughout the nation, there are now three times as many teachers in the health vocational education category as there were in 1965. Office and trades and industry instructors were also increased substantially. The increase in special program teachers reflects the general expansion of vocational education as educators at all levels of government have recognized the needs of the students and the opportunities within the expanding economy.

The number of vocational and technical education teachers was 109,136 in 1965, 190,364 in 1970 and is predicted to expand to over 280,000 in 1975. This will require 32.2 percent increase in teachers and approximately 18,000 new teacher entrants each year from 1970 to 1975 as compared with the approximated annual increase of 16,246 each year found in the last five year.

Programs for Disadvantaged Increase:

Enrollments and expenditures for disadvantaged students have increased significantly since passage of the 1968 Amendments. Data show that, of the total expendifutres for all vocational education programs, 3.9 percent was spent for persons with special needs in 1969 and 24 percent for this population in 1970. Of the $34 million spent in 1969, $8 million were Federal monies and $26 million, State and local. In 1970, 177 million was used for those with special needs. Of this, $71 million were Federal funds and $106 million, State and local monies.

State plan estimates indicate that enrollments are due to increase in 1972 over 1970 as indicated in three randomly selected states.

State	1970	1972
New York	69,245	133,550
Arizona	3,736	8,141
Virginia	12,934	16,656

Most States have assigned at least one staff member to supervise programs for the disadvantaged and handicapped and in larger States, several staff members have been assigned. The number of teachers increased from 1,102 in 1965 to 12,316 in 1970. National and Regional leadership conferences have been conducted to assist State staff members, university teacher educators and local administrators and teachers to carry out their responsibilities towards students with special needs.

Programs funded under set-asides under Part B and those under 102(b) are targeted by the States for the same disadvantaged populations. States report on all programs for persons with special needs without identifying budget source. Examples of effective programs for students with special needs are to be found in the Special Needs reports.

Serving Handicapped Students:

Special programs designed to increase the employability of handicapped students funded under the 10 percent set-aside under Part B have increased inter-agency cooperation and consolidated resources to better meet the needs of the area. Program designs and costs vary according to the extent and kind of disability.

Enrollments for handicapped trends are projected:

	1970	1973 Est.	1976 Est.
Secondary	61,000	151,000	306,000
Postsecondary	21,000	79,000	89,000
Adult	24,000	35,000	98,000

The following are examples of approaches being taken to provide programs and services to handicapped persons to enable them to succeed in education and training for employment.

Sixty-four retarded youths are enrolled in pre-vocational and vocational training, on-the-job training, placement, and training in independent living in Rhode Island. Extensive evaluation and follow-up activities are built into the program.

Twenty of these, 18 of whom had never worked before, are holding full-time paying jobs; 9 of these, who had previously lived in institutions, are now living in their own apartments. Sixteen of the 64 clients are receiving on-the-job training.

Fremont Public Schools, Michigan, purchased an old frame house in need of repair to use as a permanent home-making laboratory for educable mentally retarded girls age 12-21 who are in the school system. The project also included educable mentally retarded boys in the same age group who received training in carpentry and plumbing at the same time they helped remodel the house. The project now serves 60 boys and girls who participate in all phases of rebuilding, refurbishing, and maintaining the house and in home-making. Areas of employment are carpentry, welding, meat cutting, domestic service, and "guest house" workers. Placement of graduates is presently at 95%. Follow-up is continuous and students may return for retraining or new job placement if necessary.

The South 11th Street School in Newark, New Jersey, provides a program for 250 trainable mentally retarded children and youth to prepare them to meet job entry standards as established by the local sheltered workshop. Thus far, out of twenty students completing the program two (2) have been placed in competitive employment, eight (8) will be referred to the sheltered workshop, and two (2) have entered local manpower training programs.

The Work Adjustment Center, administered by the Anoka Hennepin School District, Minnesota, serves 80 handicapped students. Services are provided for students having all types of handicaps. The program encompasses four phases: work evaluation, work adjustment, training and job seeking. After the work evaluation and work adjustment phases the student enters the training program. Often a student is "slotted in" to certain portions of the regular vocational program which pertain to his particular, individual employment goals. Of 80 students completing the Work Adjustment Center Program since September 1970, 31% have become employed, 28% have entered vocational schools, and 23% have returned to regular school programs.

Construction of New Facilities:

During fiscal years 1965-70 slightly over 1.3 billion dollars of Federal, State and local funds were approved for building and equipping area vocational schools. This increased the number of vocational schools from 405 to 1965 to 1,676 in 1971.

Federal funds from three legislative sources are largely responsible for this rapid increase in the number and quality of area vocational schools. The following is a breakdown of funding by source of funds for Fiscal years 1965 through 1970:

	Funds Approved (Millions) 1965-1970
Vocational Education Act (1963 and 1968 Amendments)	$328.0
Appalachian Regional Commission (1965)	103.0
Economic Development Act (1965)	16.8
State and local funds	901.3
	$1,350.6

Funds Distributed to Major Cities:

A review of the funding distribution of federal vocational funds in relation to students enrolled in selected big cities.

Comparison of Percentages of States Population, Vocational Enrollment, Expenditures, and Teachers in Major Cities, FY 1970

	% of State Population	% of Total Enrollment in State	% of Federal Expenditures in State	% of State/ Local Expend. Obligated in City	% of Teachers in State
Chicago	30.3	20.9	28.9	30.3	18.5
Milwaukee	16.2	18.9	23.4	34.7	16.6
Denver	23.3	30.9	17.4	15.0	32.6
Kansas City	10.6	5.6	16.9	11.5	8.1
Philadelphia	16.5	12.4	16.7	9.1	10.8
Memphis	15.9	13.6	15.2	15.0	20.2
Minneapolis	11.4	13.6	11.5	8.8	14.7
Atlanta	10.8	11.4	11.3	9.5	11.6
St. Louis	13.3	11.9	8.9	13.1	14.1
Cleveland	7.0	6.5	5.9	2.5	5.9
Newark, N.J.	5.3	5.9	4.4	6.0	3.9
Boston	11.3	9.5	0.6	3.5	10.0

In most of the cities, Federal funds exceeded the percentage of State and local funds invested in vocational education. Chicago received a considerably larger share and Boston received disproportionately small share. Generally States indicate Federal funds to cities are being increased over prior years.

Adult Vocational Education:

Enrollment trends indicate little growth in adult vocational education programs during the five years between 1965 and 1970. Total enrollments increased from 2,378,522 in 1965 to 2,666,083 in 1970. However, the percentage distribution of adult vocational education programs to total enrollments changed from 43.8 percent in 1965 to 30.3 percent in 1970. Projected enrollments call for 3,723,000 in 1975, about 27 percent of the total.

Increases of federal programs serving disadvantaged adults and a decreasing priority in school districts with tight or deficit budgets may account for this reduction.Further studies of adult and postsecondary programs are needed to effectively assess the impact of these programs.

A study of adult vocational education (AVE) programs in three cities completed in 1971 examines some of the problems of AVE as they relate to the inner city resident. The report examines allocations of program resources with respect to the organizational delivery system, the elements of emphasis and the given environment to determine what AVE is being offered and to determine whom the program is serving.

The three cities, Philadelphia, Cleveland and San Francisco, each have different approaches in AVE within differing environments. However, the report concludes AVE programs as now structured do not and will not attract the disadvantaged due to lack of emphasis on concentrated pre-employment programs and lack of supportive services. Some attempts have been made to modify structures and programs to meet the needs of the disadvantaged. Counseling and guidance are limited to providing assistance in the selection of courses and scheduling problems. Job development is not required because individuals participating in current programs are employed.

Other Evaluation Studies:

Relatively few evaluation studies were funded prior to fiscal 1970. Among them, the following have had the most impact:

(a) A study of the duplication of effort in occupational education in three large cities has been widely circulated (in part since it is the mandate of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education). The major findings were: (1) there was little expressed concern over duplication of effort, rather on the gaps in services provided target groups; (2) there is a total lack of coordination between public vocational and manpower programs, hindered in part by the restrictions on funds of the local level. (Operations Research Inc., Design Study for the Assessment of Occupational Programs in Metropolitan Areas, November 1970).

(b) Project METRO, a study of vocational graduates in thirteen major cities, found that 60 percent of the graduates entered the labor market directly upon graduation; 25 percent entered college full-time. Preliminary results also indicated that better mechanisms are needed for matching students with training. The study has been expanded to include 25 of the Nation's largest cities and a sample of their suburban communities with emphasis on comparing success of graduates and dropouts from vocational programs with success of non-vocational students and on developing a system for obtaining follow-up data on vocational education graduates (Educational Systems Research Institute; March 1971).

(c) A national study of 100 two-year colleges was initiated in 1968 and has provided information on the characteristics of students and graduates as well as on the costs of various occupational programs. The instructional costs of occupational programs were consistently higher than those of transfer programs ($756 vs. $557 per year) because of the necessarily higher faculty/student ratios. The material was used extensively in providing backup for the Administration's student aid proposal and for the career education initiative (Bureau of Social Science Research, August 1971).

Fiscal year 1970 evaluation studies include the following:

(a) An indepth study of manpower information available and used by State and local vocational education planners (particularly in preparing State plans for Federal vocational education money) in three urban and three rural areas (National Planning Association, September 1971.) Findings indicate that States seldom use detailed manpower and demographic information as a basis for planning. In the absence of adequate follow-up information about labor market experience, information concerning job placement of the students leaving training was available only when school personnel did the placement.

(b) A feasibility study to determine whether comparisons may be made between secondary vocational education programs and manpower training programs in meeting the needs of urban disadvantaged youth in 10 urban areas (Operation Research, Inc., October 1971). Results were limited to a pre-test of instruments and an assessment of transferability to other locations.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The fiscal year 1971 activities consist of a large scale evaluation of the Basic State Grant Vocational Education Program to determine the impact of the 1968 Amendments. The study includes an assessment of the effectiveness of the various vocational strategies used on the secondary level, an analysis of the expenditures from the Federal to the local level, and a determination of the extent of duplication with other programs intended for similar target groupse in specified geographic areas. Data relating to vocational students will also be available in 1973 from a national longitudinal study of the high school class of 1972.

Studies to be completed during 1972 include:

(a) An indepth case study of 5 selected urban and rural school districts to assess the supportive services provided for disadvantaged and handicapped children to assist them in regular vocational education classes.

(b) A case study in four metropolitan cities of proprietary schools offering programs in selected occupational areas, their students and their graduates from three years ago to assess the effectiveness of these programs and to examine how they respond to changes in labor market and in public school offerings.

Two new studies will be funded during fiscal year 1972. These include:

(a) Evaluation of Work Education Programs which meet Career Development Objectives. An evaluation of existing programs will provide a base for a concerted effort to extend school supervised work experiences to more youth.

(b) Assessment of Career Guidance Counseling and Placement. This study will review the effectiveness and availability of career guidance, counseling, placement and follow-up.

Both studies will provide data to contribute to the national priority of career education, the development of alternate strategies for expanding work programs and criteria and models, including required resources, for Career Guidance, Counseling and Placement programs to be used in career education.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Design Study for the Assessment of Occupational Programs in Metropolitan Areas, Operations Research, Inc., November 1970.

Study of Adult Vocational Education Programs in Three Cities. Analytic Systems, Inc., September, 1971.

An Analysis of Manpower Requirements Information and the Availability of Vocational Education in Selected Urban and Rural Areas. National Planning Association, September 1971.

A Comparison of Vocational Education to Four Manpower Programs in Urban Areas, (A Feasibility Study)., Operations Research, Inc., October 1971

Placement and Follow-up of Vocational Education Students. Center for Vocational Education, Ohio State University, February 1970.

Trends in Vocational Education, USOE, June 1971

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

Reports from State Advisory Committees

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education-Programs for Students with Special Needs

Legislation:

Vocational Education Act of 1963, Vocational Education Amendments 1968, Part A, Section 102(b)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1972

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968		
	1969	$40,000,000	- 0 -
	1970	40,000,000	$20,000,000
	1971	50,000,000	20,000,000
	1972	60,000,000	20,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Grants are allocated to the States by formula, with no matching required, to assist in providing support for programs and services for persons who are not able to succeed in regular vocational programs because of poor academic background, lack of motivation and depressing environmental factors. Programs are concentrated within the States in areas where there is high incidence of youth unemployment and school dropouts. Special services and programs are provided these disadvantaged students to encourage them to stay in school to acquire the academic and occupational skills needed for successful employment when they leave school or to pursue their career preparation.

Special services provided include specially trained teachers in remedial and bilingual specialties, staff aides, additional counseling services, facilities accessible to a high concentration of these students, and instructional materials and equipment best suited to their understanding and abilities.

Among the areas where these funds have been expended are those where English is a second language, rural depressed communities, low-cost housing in the inner-city, correctional institutions, and off-reservation localities inhabited by American Indians.

Coordinated efforts have been made with other educational and social agency resources to provide, as completely as possible, the total supportive services that a student might need in his vocational education such as remedial work, individual scheduling, and special counseling.

State utilize the 102(b) and the 15 percent set-aside for disadvantaged provided under Part B of the Act for the same target group. The present reporting system does not differentiate but reports total disadvantaged and handicapped served within each State. Enrollment totals are reported under Part B.

Program Effectiveness:

Effectiveness is judged on the basis of increasing the number of persons served; we have no clear measure yet of the quality of the services provided. Based on a cost of $400 of Federal funds per disadvantaged student over and above the costs of regular vocational programs, it is estimated that almost 50,000 disadvantaged youth and adults were provided special services and/or programs during fiscal year 1971.

Each State has developed individual plans for providing services and programs for students who have academic, socioeconomic or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program.

State and local supervisors monitor the special needs programs and attempts have been made to identify successful programs and to make information about instructional materials and practices available to other areas. As a result, increases in State and local funds have been targeted to disadvantaged students.

Examples of successful programs that have been identified are the following:

Sixty unemployed and underemployed mentally retarded adults in the Kensington-Arnold School district, Pennsylvania, are in cooperative--vocational education special needs programs. They are being trained for and working in specific jobs in carpentry, auto mechanics, office practice and building maintenance. One hundred fifty disadvantaged students were trained through Pittsburgh schools and employed in fabric maintenance and commercial food preparation. This was a cooperative venture between the Pittsburgh Board of Education and Goodwill Industries.

A cooperative program, providing work experience for handicapped and disadvantaged youth was in operation at Roxboro High School in Person County, North Carolina, during 1970. Many of the disadvantaged and mentally retarded youth were placed on jobs where they were closely supervised by employer and school coordinator. Classroom instruction was geared to meet

The individual needs of the youth and remedial instruction in communication and computational skills was provided.

The Division of Vocational Education in Connecticut in cooperation with the State Department of Correction, State Department of Labor, and Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, selected 50 inmates to attend Wilcox Technical School in Meriden. The inmates are transported by bus from the Chesire Reformatory to attend Wilcox Technical School three hours daily, starting at 3:30 p.m. for courses in Automotive Mechanics, Printing, Drafting, Sheet Metalwork, and Machine Operation. As each inmate completes his course, he is given a certificate. The youth are chosen with a view that as they complete their courses they will be eligible for parole and placement in jobs. The program operates continuously on an open-entry, open exit basis with a minimum training of four months.

In the Learning, Earning Education Program (LEEP) at Atlanta, Georgia, 151 high school dropouts and unemployed youth were enrolled during the first 11 months of the program. Of the 106 who completed the 12-week program, 73 (or 70 percent) of these graduates are employed on the level of their training. Thirty-three were not placed indicating a need for increased job placement services. Forty-five of the enrollees did not finish; of these 31 left because of financial hardship. This program differs in two significant ways from the work skill curricula that are commonly practiced. Emphasis is placed on the extra-vocational tensions that arise in a job situation. The LEEP Coordinator arranges an instructional program which involves three activities: (1) instruction and skills, suitable to an entry level in 12 weeks; (2) instruction in the basic methematics and communications skills required for success of learning the skill; and (3) group guidance and counseling intended to improve the student's ability to get and keep a job.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Additional information on the extent to which disadvantaged and handicapped students are served will be available from the Impact Study, described under Part B.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

State Advisory Council Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education-Research and Training

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
VEA of 1963, as amended 1968 Part C, Section 131(b)	Permanent

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	$11,850,000	$11,850,000
	1966	17,750,000	17,750,000
	1967	22,500,000	10,000,000
	1968	22,500,000	13,550,000
	1969	35,500,000	11,550,000
	1970	56,000,000	17,000,000
	1971	67,500,000	35,750,000
	1972	67,500,000	18,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are made to States to support vocational education research and research personnel training programs; developmental, experimental or pilot programs designed to meet the special vocational needs of youths, especially disadvantaged youths; demonstration and dissemination projects; and to support the establishment and operation of State Research Coordinating Units (RCU's). The RCU is the officially designated unit located in the State department of education or in a State university which administers the State's vocational research programs and disseminates research findings to assist administrators, teachers and counselors, and teacher educators.

Matching requirements call for 75 percent Federal and 25 percent State/local funding for the operation of RCU's and 90 percent Federal and 10 percent State/local funding for R&D projects conducted under grants and contracts of each year's appropriation; 50% of the Federal funds are expended at the discretion of the Commissioner.

Program Effectiveness:

Because of the developmental and basic research aspects of the program it is not possible to assess the incidence of use after development although this is the ideal measure of effectiveness. New efforts relating to career education have provisions for evaluation. These are detailed in the section describing programs funded by the U.S. Office of Education. Reports on State research projects and studies under Part C indicate that of grants or contracts made during fiscal year 1971 over 63 percent of the funds expended went to support research and development in career education. Other priority areas receiving attention were: Problems of disadvantaged students; cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit of programs and services; improvement of State and local administration of vocational education; program and system evaluation; new and emerging occupational areas; and vocational guidance.

Examples of these projects and studies include the following:

Arizona

"The Development of a Cost Factor for Occupational Education Average Daily Attendance"

This program will utilize a technique for dividing school expenditures between those directed toward occupational programs and all other programs.

Arkansas

"The Development of Vocational Orientation Packets for Use by Teachers in the Elementary School"

A project which will involve elementary school personnel and other educational specialists in the preparation of instructional packets aimed at vocational orientation in grades one thru six.

California

"Comparative Costs of Manpower Education: A Methodological Study"

The project will develop a model that can be used by school personnel for examining a number of manpower training programs and translating their components into comparable units to facilitate comparing costs of different training programs for similar jobs.

"An Experimental Research Project to Test a More Effective Means to Achieve Stated Work Experience Education Program Goals"

This project is intended to determine whether or not the number of work experience students (particularly disadvantaged and handicapped), and the variety and skill levels of work experience jobs can be increased over their present levels through the use of proceduralized instruction.

Nebraska

"Assessment of Instructional Effectiveness of Nebraska Vocational Technical School Educational Offerings, 1965-1969"

This follow-up study will evaluate instruction at Nebraska Vocational Technical School. A profile of jobs at the entry level of employment will be obtained, relevancy of present training to present employment opportunities will be investigated, and information leading to implementation of positive program changes will be obtained.

New York

"A Study of Cost Per Graduate and Returns on Educational Investment in Technology in a Two-Year College"

This study will use the techniques of linear programming to compare cost per graduate in technology and non-technology programs in terms of earning capacity of the graduates.

Ohio

"The Impact of a Career Orientation Program upon Junior High School Students in Cincinnati, Ohio"

Interviews of students and teachers will provide data regarding the extent to which knowledge of the world of work has been expanded, and attitudinal changes about occupational careers have been experienced, and factors associated with such changes.

Oregon

"A Model for Curriculum Development in Career Awareness and Exploration"

This project will develop related curricula and materials for career awareness in grades 1-6 and career exploration in grades 7-10. The model will be pilot tested in the schools of one local school district.

There has been considerable evidence of wide diffusion of R&D products developed in the States or by Office of Eudcation grants and contracts. The RCU's have been instrumental in many States in promoting and assisting adoption of practices and programs developed elsewhere.

Examples of these include the following:

> Project VIEW (Vocational Information on Education and Work) was originally developed under an Office of Education grant in California and now has spread to 23 States throughout the country.
>
> Two career education curriculums were developed under the USOE R&D grants at Ohio State University, entitled "World of Construction" and "World of Manufacturing." These are exploratory career education programs designed for junior high students. They are now in use in some local districts in nearly every State.
>
> A project at the Ohio State University R&D Center in Vocational Technical Education developed a "System for State Evaluation of Vocational Edcuation," which has been adopted by several States as their evaluation system.
>
> A project developed by the Illinois State RCU "Computerized Vocational Information System" has served as a model for other computerized guidance systems being developed and has been implemented in various school districts throughout the country.

Many RCU's now operate extensive information retrieval and dissemination systems to support the latter function and other are in the process of developing such systems. Other RCU functions have included their performance of a good deal of Statewide evaluation, as well as evaluation for local districts. The RCU's assist the States in planning efforts and frequently are assigned to coordinate the State-administered Exemplary Projects under Part D.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

State Advisory Council Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education-Exemplary Programs

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
VEA of 1963, as amended 1968 Part D	June 30, 1972

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968		
	1969	$15,000,000	-0-
	1970	57,500,000	13,000,000
	1971	75,000,000	16,000,000
	1972	75,000,000	16,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are awarded to the States to stimulate new ways to create a bridge between school and earning a living for young people. Programs must be directed to the job preparation needs of those who end their education at or before completion of the secondary level, or who are in post-secondary vocational programs and for exemplary and innovative occupational programs or projects which are designed to broaden occupational aspirations and opportunities for youths, particularly disadvantaged youths, and to serve as models for use in vocational education programs.

Fifty percent of each State's allotment is for use by the State agency and the remaining fifty percent is reserved by the Commissioner for project grants or contracts. No matching is required.

Program Effectiveness:

Projects funded under Part D are now in their second year and only scattered data are available to indicate effectiveness. The effectiveness of these programs may be indicated by the example that the school-based career education model now under contract by USOE's National Center for Educational Research and Development was based on experience gained during the first year operation of the Exemplary Projects. In fact, 5 of the 6 districts selected by NCERD for the large scale demonstration of this model received program impetus during 1971 from either State-administered or Federally-administered Part D funds. Each of the program components included in this Model is operational in some project, although not all in a single project, funded under Part D of the Vocational Education Amendments.

The States of Delaware, Georgia, Maryland, New Jersey, Illinois, and Wyoming are now moving to develop State-wide plans for the implementation of career development programs and the State legislature in Arizona, during its most recent session, made available $2 million for the first State implementationof K-14 career education programs.

Of the original 150 projects funded by the States from their share of Exemplary Program funds in 1971, 80 were directed at demonstrating and disseminating career development activities. In financial terms 67% of the States Part D funds were directed to projects which delivered activities now being defined as essential to a comprehensive program of career education.

The funds controlled by the Commissioner have been directed at implementing, in demonstration sites, new techniques associated with the delivery of career education in grades K-14 which have proved to be successful in prior R&D efforts. Components added to the basic U.S.O.E. requirements for sequential career development activities have been added.

The Kansas State Department elected to combine their portion of the Part D funds with the Commissioner's portion in order to develop and demonstrate three career development programs -- one in an urban area, Kansas City; one in suburban Lawrence; and the third in the rural area of Clay County. Assistance from the State Department and from Kansas State University provides for the attainment of common goals through a variety of techniques in th differing project environments. It also promotes replication of these programs to other districts in the State.

The Missouri project, located in Kansas City, has a mobile counseling unit which operated in an inner-city area to assist out-of-school youngsters in identifying their career potential and in securing placement either in a job, in a Junior College program, or in a manpower training program.

Twenty-three projects presently funded are designed primarily to serve disadvantaged and handicapped students. Eighteen of these programs are located in areas designed to receive funds under the Model Cities program. In all of the projects, supportive services such as occupational guidance and counseling and job placement are provided the student. Other projects are able to use their services of local community or educational agencies. Helena, Montana, for instance, is utilizing the services of the Vocational Rehabilitation Center and the Indian Alliance to better assist the students.

The impact of Federally-administered Part D funds has been multiplied by the State's investment in the same operational setting of job training funds under Part B, and cooperative education funds under Part G, both of which are administered by the State Board for Vocational Education under the State Plan. As one example of the multiplier effect of the investment of Federally-administered Part D funds, the following table indicates the actual fiscal year 1970 investment of Federal, State, and local dollars in the project entitled: "Career Centered Curriculum for Vocational Complexes in Mississippi."

Section 142(c) Federally-administered Part D funds	$107,761
Section 142(d) State-administered Part D funds	116,278
Section 122(a) State-administered Part B funds	88,560
Set-aside for Disadvantaged and Handicapped	4,468
State-level matching funds	132,840
Section 172(a) State-administered Part G, Cooperative Education funds	13,295
State-level Minimum Foundation funds	137,360
Total for one year (FY 1970)	$600,562

EPDA funds have been used to train teachers in four other Mississippi counties to use the materials and practices developed in the Jones County program.

The overall strategy in 1972 is to continue the development and demonstration of small-scale comprehensive career education models, encompassing grades 1-12 or 1-14, which involve unifying the entire school program around the career development theme; featuring extensive community, industrial, and business involvement, making heavy use of cooperative education; and stressing active placement of every exiting student in either a job or further education. In addition, encouragement and development assistance will be provided the States as they move to develop their State-wide implementation of career education programs.

Fifty-one such Federally administered projects have been continued and 5 new projects were started in 1972. States will develop and implement approximately 300 projects, 200 of which will be directed to implementing career development programs and activities which are tailored to local needs and conditions.

In 1973, this program along with Vocational Cooperative Education, Vocational Education Curriculum Development and Manpower Development and Training programs will be part of a career education demonstration and development package. In particular, Part D funds will be used to develop models of postsecondary programs articulated with comprehensive K-12 career education activities and out-of-school manpower training programs. Particular attention will be given to disadvantaged populations in inner cities and rural areas.

Each of the individual Federally-administered projects is required by the Federal Regulations to have an independent evaluation by a third-party agency. The State-administered exemplary projects are evaluated by the State Advisory Councils for Vocational Education as a part of their overall responsibility for evaluating all programs covered by the State Plan for Vocational Education. In the evaluation data now available, there is evidence that at grades 1-5 a significant positive gain has been found between the pre-test measures of student attitude toward work within schools engaged in K-12 career development projects. Other evaluation studies show that elementary students showed significant gains in occupational knowledge.

Statistics indicate that the career development activities have resulted in increased attendance by disadvantaged students at the junior and senior high levels and in many instances, baseline data have been gathered against which changes in standardized achievement test scores for students engaged in career development activities will be measured. Cooperative education programs are continuing to improve student retention in the Exemplary Programs, and Intensive Training Programs for graduates and dropouts are proving successful in preparing youngsters, both graduates without vocational training and dropouts, for immediate placement in jobs requiring limited job skills.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Information relating to some activities funded under Part D will be reported in the ongoing "Impact" study.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Reports

State Advisory Council Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education-Consumer and Homemaking Education

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
VEA of 1963, as amended 1968, Part F	June 30, 1972

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriaton
	1965		
	1966		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968		
	1969		
	1970	$25,000,000	$17,500,000
	1971	35,000,000	21,250,000
	1972	50,000,000	25,625,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are allocated to the States to assist them in the preparation of youths and adults for the role of homemaker or to contribute to the employability of such youths and adults in the dual role of homemaker and wage earner. Programs are conducted in consumer education, nutrition, child care and guidance, improvement of home environment, and management of resources. At least one-third of these funds must be used in economically depressed areas or areas with high rates of unemployment. Matching is 50/50 except for programs in economically depressed areas where the Federal share may reach 90%. Part F is to be distinguished from other parts of the law since "homemaking" is not defined as vocational education for gainful employment; gainful home economics programs may be funded through Part B.

Program Effectiveness:

Measuring the effectiveness of consumer and homemaking education remains difficult due to the nonquantifiable nature of its program objectives. Most data are of an anecdotal nature and do not lend themselves to valid generalizations.

There has been an increase in programs in depressed areas (partly in response to the 1968 Amendments which require that one-third of the Federal share be spent there); more programs to emphasize consumer education and preparation for dual responsibilities of homemaker and wage earner have emerged. Most of the approximately 2.5 million youth and adults enrolled in consumer and homemaking programs in fiscal year 1970 had some consumer education. In Arkansas, over 75 new adult classes in consumer education were offered. In New Jersey a "Consumer Education Center" has been established in one of the Manpower Skills Centers where materials and assistance are offered anyone in the State who needs help in developing programs in consumer education. A "Young Consumers" project, offered by the vocational youth groups in this same State, reached hundreds of young people with consumer information. In Ohio the home economics staff in the State Department of Education are taking the lead in a State-wide development in consumer education to be offered K-12 in the schools. The following are examples of some of the consumer and homemaking programs being offered in depressed areas:

Ohio

An "Impact" program for inner-city junior high school students includes small classes so teachers can give much individual help with personal development, grooming, human relationships, consumer education; counseling to help students realize they have abilities and with training can acquire good jobs; parent contacts and help for the mothers in the home so they realize the school is their friend and helper. Potential dropouts who have enrolled in this program to date have high retention rates.

North Dakota

The "Consumers in the Know", and adult education project serving a depressed rural county in the State. By means of a Traveling Book Service, informational fliers, and public meetings, approximately 470 persons were helped with various consumer education topics.

Texas

In several of the major cities home economics teachers are placed in public housing development. Through individual and group teaching most of the families in these centers are reached with consumer education, nutrition education, home management and child care.

New York State

Neighborhood centers have been opened in cooperation with city welfare departments in the major cities in the State. Individual and group instruction are offered during the days and evenings on nutrition and meal management using food stamps, making over and altering clothing, homemade play equipment for children, consumer education and home management.

Florida

A mobile unit with a home economics inctructor and teaching materials is moved among the migrant camps and simple lessons in Spanish are offered the families on consumer education, nutrition, child care.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

State Advisory Council Reports

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education - Cooperative Vocational Education Programs

Legislation:

VEA of 1963, as amended 1968, Part G

Expiration Date:
June 30, 1972

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968		
	1969	$20,000,000	-0-
	1970	35,000,000	14,000,000
	1971	50,000,000	18,500,000
	1972	75,000,000	19,500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are made to the States to support cooperative education programs which involve arrangements between schools and employers, enabling students to receive part-time vocational instruction in the school and related on-the-job training through part-time employment. Priority is given to areas where there is high incidence of student dropouts and youth unemployment. Students must be at least 14 years old to be included and are paid by the employer either a minimum wage or at the student learner rate established by the Labor Department. Federal support may cover program operation, training costs to employers, payment for services or unusual costs to students while in training, and program coordinators. Federal funds may be used for all or part of a State's expenditure for programs authorized and approved under this activity.

Cooperative vocational education programs have expanded along the lines of specific fields of work; such as marketing and distribution, business and office occupations, and health occupations. In addition, there was an emphasis on developing cooperative education programs for small communities which cut across several fields of work. This enabled students to enroll in vocational education programs in specialized occupational areas which were not available previously because of lack of sufficient enrollment or facilities. Primary consideration was given to developing programs in areas having high rates of school dropouts and youth unemployment.

In 1972-73 special emphasis will be placed on cooperative education programs which contribute to the career education goal by providing a relatively inexpensive method to reach and prepare thousands of students who may not otherwise acquire a marketable skill before leaving school. Increased emphasis will be given to the implementation of those special provisions under Part G which permit the payment of unusual costs that the student may not reasonably be expected to assume while pursuing a cooperative vocational program. These emphases will result in the involvement of more disadvantaged youth in cooperative vocational education programs.

Program Effectiveness:

Most effectiveness data on cooperative programs are limited to local studies or to restricted occupational fields, with little follow-up information on program completers. Although cooperative vocational education is held in high regard in most circles, the available data do not permit generalizations on a national level.

One possible indication of program success has been the large expansion in cooperative enrollments within the past few years. The Part G legislation has generated an expansion of cooperative training programs. Cooperative enrollments show an increase of over 290% from an enrollment of 23,001 in 1970, to an enrollment of 90,250 in 1971. There is also evidence that the emphasis on cooperative education in Part G of the legislation has generated an expansion of the number of cooperative education programs funded with the State basis grants under Part B. There were 340,550 students enrolled in Part B cooperative vocational education programs in contrast to 266,914 in fiscal year 1970.

The major source for employment figures and other effectiveness information on cooperative programs is State reports. Alabama reports 45 percent of the cooperative students are hired at the completion of training. Texas reports 59.3 percent of their cooperative students are hired upon completion of the program. Texas further reports 26.6 percent remain with the cooperating business after one year; 21.2 after two years, and 12.7 percent after three years.

The University of Tennessee under contract with the U.S. Office of Education conducted a study in 1969 to gather information from schools and business involved in 64 industry-school training programs for the disadvantaged. One of the chief factors cited as leading to initiating the cooperative programs was the need to reduce the school dropout rate. Data from the 64 programs studies reported:

-77% of the persons entering the program completed the full cycle of training

-81% of these stayed on the job for which they were trained

-Dropout rates were reduced by 25 to 35% in a number of the participating schools

-47% of the employers reported a reduced turnover rate among the graduates

-Counseling for career planning, provided by the schools and employers, was available in 88% of these programs.

Reports from big city programs enrolling inner-city minority youth in cooperative programs, while small in size, indicate that such programs do have good retention rates and that trainees are employed after completing the training cycle. Those enrolling dropouts have had some success in encouraging trainees to earn high school diplomas. For example, Newark has enrolled 350 students and dropouts since 1964. Of these, 190 have earned high school diplomas, 121 are employed; 8 are in military service; 15 home-makers; 20 in college; 26 unemployed or status is unknown. One hundred are still in the program. The overall retention rate has been 60-65%.

In Detroit, Chrysler enrolled 94 potential dropouts in special summer programs. Of these, 88 completed the programs and were offered jobs; 44 accepted employment and continued training.

The State of Georgia funded new cooperative programs which cut across occupational service lines and enrolled students from the 8th through the 12th grades. Mathematics, English, and science programs related to their vocational programs. Students were selected for the program only if they were potential dropouts achieving two or more grade levels below their peers. The dropout rate for students in these cooperative education programs was less than 3 percent. There was a significant improvement in the attendance, interest in school and grade point average among the potential dropouts served in the program.

Studies undertaken in Illinois, Michigan, and other States indicate only a one percent unemployment rate among students participating in co-op programs. Another study found that 40 percent of the high school co-op students enrolled for post secondary vocational education even though many had not previously planned to continue their education.

By December 1, 1971, the State of Ohio will place on the job approximately 4,000 high school youth in cooperative office occupations programs in about 200 different schools. In 1970, the Ohio office cooperative students earned $4,282,909 during their job training and these youth reported over $718,000 went into their saving accounts.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

In an ongoing study funded in fiscal year 1970, twelve school districts (offering both cooperative and non-cooperative vocational education programs) are being examined to (1) identify the types of cooperative vocational education programs being conducted, (2) compare the costs of vocational education programs with and without a cooperative component to ascertain hidden costs, and (3) determine insofar as possible, the effectiveness of the programs and extent to which target populations are reached.

Beginning in fiscal year 1972, an evaluation of existing work experience programs will be undertaken to provide a base for a concerted effort to extend school-supervised work experience to more youth. More specifically, the administrative and organizational designs of work experience programs will be examined along with their purposes and subpurposes, with attention paid to identifying and interpreting constraints or limitations in carrying out expanding work education programs.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Vocational Education Reports State Advisory Committee Reports Review and Synthesis of Research in Cooperative Vocational Education (Eric Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education, 1970)

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education-Work Study Programs

Legislation:

VEA of 1963, as amended 1968 Part H

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1972

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	$30,000,000	$ 5,000,000
	1966	50,000,000	25,000,000
	1967	35,000,000	10,000,000
	1968	35,000,000	10,000,000
	1969	35,000,000	- 0 -
	1970	35,000,000	5,000,000
	1971	45,000,000	5,500,000
	1972	55,000,000	6,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are allocated to the States for work-study programs to assist economoically disadvantaged full-time vocational educational students, ages 15-20, to remain in school by providing part-time employment with public employers. Priority is given to areas of greater school dropout rates and youth employment. Funds are used for the development and administration of the program and for compensation of students by the local educational agencies or other public agencies or institutions. Matching is 80 percent Federal and 20 percent State and local.

Work study is essentially an income maintenance program for the economically deprived youth who are in school. Only 2% of the Federal funds is used for administration; 98% of these funds go directly to needy students in the form of wages for a public service job.

Average cost per student will increase from $275 in 1972 to $300 in 1973. This increase is based on legislation that is being proposed to make private organizations eligible employers under this program and to increase the level of compensation for students to at least the Department of Labor student/learner rate (75 percent of minimum wage).

The work study program is in line with the career education objective of preparing every individual with a marketable skill or for further education. Students provided financial assistance are the economically disadvantaged who are apt to drop out of school before obtaining sufficient job skills for economic independence. Retention of these students in school opens numerous additional options for the student in employment and further education.

Program Effectiveness:

The effectiveness of this program is usually judged on the basis of the number of students served since work-study has been essentially an income maintenance program.

Vocational work study was first authorized in the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Since then 211,273 have been enrolled in work study programs.

Although the primary purpose of the work-study program is to provide financial support for vocational students, reports from the States reveal that many other gains accrue. One State indicated that more then two-thirds of its students were provided work directly related to the field they were studying. Typical positions held by work-study students included: photographer's assistant, food service worker, clerk-typist, hospital aide, printing assistant, drafting assistant, furniture repairman, and appliance repairman.

Work-study impacts heavily upon disadvantaged male youth in high school. Of the secondary work-study enrollees, 61.6% are male although only 37.4% of all secondary vocational students are male. However, work-study programs now support only 2% of the estimated 800,000 economically disadvantaged youth enrolled in vocational education programs.

Wisconsin reported that substantial amounts of supervisory time during the year were devoted to integrating work-study opportunities with other student financial aid programs including postsecondary sources. There was close coordination of work-study with local and State funds, including the State student loan program, with various State and local scholarship funds and with a special State scholarship fund for Indian students.

South Carolina indicated that the program was well received by school administrators, teachers, and students, and cited the following information from a survey made by the participating schools:

1) 85 percent of the schools said that daily attendance of the student participants had improved.

2) 79 percent observed an improved behavorial change in the participants towards the school and school activities.

3) 75 percent said the program had kept students from dropping out of school.

4) 96 percent favored continuing the work-study program.

In fiscal year 1971, 20,000 students were financially assisted in order to remain in school. Some 70 percent attended schools in areas of high rates of school dropouts.

Louisiana reported that 76 percent attended schools in areas of high rates of school dropouts. Louisiana reported that 76 percent of the work study students were from schools in areas of high youth unemployment and 70 percent were from schools in areas of high rates of school dropouts. Most States operated work study programs on both the secondary and post-secondary levels of instruction. One half were students living in inner-city areas.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no ongoing studies. Beginning in fiscal year 1972, an evaluation of existing work experience programs will be undertaken to provide a base for a concerted effort to extend school supervised work experiences to more youth. Along with analyzing the organizational designs and purposes of various types of work experience programs, attention will be paid to identifying and interpreting constraints or limitations in carrying out or expanding work education programs.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

State Advisory Council Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education-Curriculum Development

Legislation:

VEA of 1963, as amended 1968 Part I

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1972

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968		
	1969	$7,000,000	- 0 -
	1970	10,000,000	$ 880,000
	1971	10,000,000	4,000,000
	1972	10,000,000	4,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides assistance to State and local educational agencies in the development of curricula for new and changing occupations, and to coordinate improvements in and dissemination of existing curriculum materials, and training of personnel in curriculum development. It authorizes the Commissioner to make grants or contracts with colleges and universities, State boards and other public or nonprofit private agencies and institutions, or contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, or institution. No matching is required.

Program Effectiveness:

Program effectiveness is judged mainly by the number of curriculum projects developed and by the extent of their dissemination and use. To date, only four of the 39 projects funded in FY 70 and FY 71 have been completed; no funds have been obligated for the printing of these materials.

Nineteen curriculum projects were funded in FY 70, the first year of funding. All projects should be competed by March 1972. Approximately, one-half of the funds in 1970 was allotted for 13 curriculum projects at the postsecondary level. Three projects for curriculum guides were funded in the area of new and emerging occupations, namely: Urban Planning and Development; Air Pollution Control Technology; and Pediatric Office Assistant. Nine projects were funded for curriculum guides in the area of expanding occupations, namely: Police Science Technology; Library Assistant; Medical Radiologic Technology; Upgrading Nursing Assistants (to licensed PN's); Air Traffic Controller; Social Worker Technician; Educational Media Technology; and Veterinary Technology.

Twenty curriculum development projects were funded during fiscal year 1971, 16 of which were directed toward specific aspects of career education: of these, nine projects focused on nine job cluster curricula at various levels of career education to achieve a major modification of the educational system; seven other projects are programmed for career development in emerging transportation fields, environmental occupations, computer sciences, occupational awareness (grades 1, 2, and 3), national guidance handbook for career development, career education awareness (a machine-aided instructional program for grades K-12 to develop career development awareness which shows unusual potential for group, individual, remedial, and guidance activities for all students at a low cost and career awareness for school administrators). Other projects include development of a planning guide for local educational agencies, curriculum development by teachers of the disadvantaged and handicapped, and the use of Air Force materials in vocational-technical education.

The completed projects when disseminated should help:

-- Improve the planning and management aspects of occupational education at all levels.

-- Develop cooperative education programs in small schools.

-- Facilitate the expansion and quality of consumer and homemaking education programs for out-of-school youth and adults.

-- Provide States and LEA's annotated listings of curriculum materials available from public education agencies for use in improving the teaching-learning process.

Twenty-nine curriculum laboratories have been created in 19 States, partly in response to Federal funding in curriculum development. The labs are organized as part of State staffs or as university staffs and are funded by State or university sources. Various labs have conducted teacher education workshops on the effective use of laboratory-produced materials; they also assist in the dissemination process of U.S. Office of Education materials. In addition, they cooperated with U.S. Office of Education in the original compilation and listings of curriculum materials in vocational education.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

State Advisory Council Reports

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Adult Education - Grants to States

Legislation:

Adult Education Act of 1966
(Title III, P.L. 91-230)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History:

Year:	Authorization:	Appropriation:
1965	Authorized under EAO	$18,612,000
1966	Authorized under EAO	19,689,063
1967	$40,000,000	26,280,000
1968	60,000,000	32,200,000
1969	70,000,000	36,000,000
1970	160,000,000	40,000,000
1971	200,000,000	44,875,000
1972	225,000,000	51,300,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are made to the States for the purpose of eliminating functional illiteracy among the Nation's adults by expanding educational opportunities and encouraging programs that will enable adults 16 years of age and older to continue their education to enable them to become more employable, productive and responsible citizens.

Providing adult basic education is emphasized for those adults with less than an eighth grade level of education since the law states that special emphasis be given adult basic education programs except where such needs can be shown to have been met in the State. Local school districts participate by submitting proposals and plans to the State education agency. Matching requirements are a minimum of 10 percent of total cost by the States and local education agencies and 90 percent Federal funds.

Program Effectiveness:

Increasing numbers of adults, over 600,000 in fiscal year 1971, were enrolled in Adult Education programs; however, insufficient measures are available to assess the quality of training or the impact of the training on the participants.

It is encouraging to note that over half of the State Departments of Education are contracting for independent evaluations.

Enrollments increased about 70,000 or 13 percent over fiscal year 1970. Almost 100,000 of the enrollees completed the program and about 80 percent were in the priority target group between 18 and 44. Costs average $75 per student, based only on Federal grants to States.

In a State-wide survey of a sample of 509 adult basic education students, Ohio found that 41% of its ABE enrollees earned less than $3,000 and 20% said they were currently receiving welfare. In fiscal year 1970, 16,000 adults were enrolled in the Ohio ABE program. Evidence indicates that as a result of the instruction in adult basic education 1,500 became employed, 1,200 received promotions or were upgraded by their employer, 322 discontinued public welfare, 700 earned their General Equivalency high school diploma after graduating from the adult basic program, 107 enrolled in vocational courses, 1,000 learned to write their name, 1,100 registered to vote, and 670 voted for the first time.

Utah indicated that one of the greatest problems limiting student recruitment was lack of transportation cost. The pending USOE regulations have been changed to authorize transportation costs for students.

In a two-year study performed by the New York State Department of Education concerning reading gains and their relationship to intensity and duration of instruction, it was found that 9 to 12 hours of instruction per week are required for maximum reading gains.

Examples of programs funded under basic grants include:

Louisiana established the Northeast Louisiana Learning Center in Monroe, July 1, 1969. Since that time, 1,078 have enrolled. Beginning with 4 classes it has now grown to 28 classes. Of the 2,078 adults enrolled in the program 468 have received their general education development diploma. of the 468 graduates, 72 have enrolled in college. The program provides adult basic education classes supported by Federal and State funds and adult high school classes supported solely by State funds. More than a dozen agencies and businesses participate in the program.

In a coordinated attempt in four Midwestern cities to improve recruiting practices and resolve the reading problems of both parents and their children, both parents and children were recruited into learning centers. Some 25 families, a total of about 150 participants, were enrolled in each of the four centers. The undereducated parents were taught methods to teach reading to their children who had reading problems. The motivation of the parents and children improved their reading ability from 1 to 3 grade levels. It is planned to expand this concept to other areas especially in line with the national Right to Read effort.

ABE programs extend services to many target populations. About 92,838 (or 18 percent) of the students in fiscal year 1970 were enrolled in classes for English as a Second Language (ESL). Approximately 60,000 or 11.7% were institutionalized in jail, mental **hospitals, prisons** or other facilities.

In fiscal year 1972, the objective of the State grant adult education program will continue to be that of providing basic education to as many of the undereducated adult population as possible. In addition, efforts will be made to encourage States to adapt the program curriculums to the overall objectives of the U.S. Office of Education. This will include especially the effort to abolish functional illiteracy in the nation through the Right to Read program; the new Career Education Concepts; and meeting the needs of the Disadvantaged and the Handicapped.

Cooperative arrangements with other public and private agencies at all levels will be continued and strengthened, including those that emphasize the use of other Federal program funds, such as title V of ESEA and EPDA, to assist in training State and local adult basic education program managers and staff. Efforts will be made to coordinate the planning, and when justified, the joint funding of training programs.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Office of Education recently funded a major longitudinal follow-up of Adult Basic Education enrollees from fiscal year 1971 funds. Project duration will be approximately 18 months as the design requires obtaining personal interview data from the enrollees at two different times during the study. Over 2,200 enrollees at 100 different sites will be interviewed while enrolled and 9 months after separation from the program.

Comprehensive data will be collected on each of the enrollee's socio-economic, educational, occupational, and family background; his reasons and means for getting into the adult basic education program; his occupational, educational and financial aspirations; and other relevant social, psychological and economic factors (including the extent to which the enrollee is also the beneficiary of services from other sources). The contractor will also provide evaluation models for use at the State Department level. Complete findings will be available during the winter of 1972, however the contractor will brief the State Directors of Adult Basic Education and share early findings at the annual spring conference of State Directors and Office of Education personnel.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual Program Reports from the States

Selected Merit Award Programs identified by Regional Offices.

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Adult Education - Special Projects

Legislation:

Adult Education Act of 1966
(Title III, P.L. 230, Section 309(b)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History:

Year:	Authorization:	Appropriation:
1965		
1966		
1967*	Section 304(a) provides that not less than 10 percent, nor more than 20 percent of total appropriation shall be reserved for purposes of Section 309.	$1,520,162
1968		6,550,000
1969		7,000,000
1970		8,000,000
1971		7,000,000
1972		7,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Project grants are awarded to local educational agencies or other public or private nonprofit agencies, including educational television stations, for the purpose of experimentation with new teaching techniques, methods, programs, and with new operational and administrative systems to strengthen the ongoing State grant adult education program. Required matching is 10% of the cost of the project wherever feasible.

Priorities are developed on an annual basis to assure support of the Commissioner's objectives. The special project authority provides the Commissioner an opportunity to experiment and develop new programs and adult education systems so as to discover more effective means of motivating and teaching the undereducated. Projects have been selected that focus on the unique needs of bi-cultural group who need to learn English as a second language. Projects of national significance are funded that are beyond the scope of a local school system. However, prior to awarding a grant the objectives of the project must be of such a nature that the results could be replicated by a local school system.

Program Effectiveness:

Special projects, generally development and experimental in design are evaluated as a part of the project package; however, data is scattered and not conducive to providing ideal measures for assessing impact on the basic State programs.

Evidence that the basic programs have been able to incorporate certain products and techniques can be identified. These include methods of working with hard-core disadvantaged persons such as the development of learning centers, using State and private support in Newark and Camden, New Jersey. Developed under a special grant to the New Jersey State Department of Education, the project developed guidelines for establishing and administering learning centers which have been used since the Spring of 1970 in mini-centers throughout New Jersey and in replicating centers in American Samoa and in 21 cities across the country.

Another outreach program that originated as a special project, the Adult Armchair Education Program of the Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC) in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, is also being replicated in other cities. A workshop in the summer of 1971 in Philadelphia on ABE in home-based classes in ghetto neighborhoods drew 49 participants from 24 cities. Already three new programs -- in Dallas, Boston, and the District of Columbia -- are in operation as a result of the workshop.

Guidance and counseling materials and techniques tested over a period of three years at the University of Texas have been the focus of teacher-training institutes for over 4,000 teachers in Region VI during this period. The subjects covered in broad categories are awareness of human needs, community structure impact on illiterate adults, domestic and marital problems affecting classroom performance, the drop-out problem and vocational personnel and educational counseling. In addition, a 30-minute film on counseling to be used with the materials has been made available to each ABE State Director. The multi-media materials consist of overhead transparencies, audio-tapes and written scripts.

At the completion of the project, training sessions were conducted in all but two of the 10 HEW regions. The materials have been adopted by various States and training programs using these materials have reached over 10,000 State administrators, ABE teachers and guidance counselors. The training has usually been provided to teachers who have counseling functions because of the shortage of ABE counselors.

Among the projects that have focused on findings, special services, and resources for the ABE programs is that conducted by Montclair (New Jersey) State College. The project collected, abstracted, and distributed to the field during fiscal year 1971 information on curricular and instructional materials developed by publishers and in State and local programs and special projects.

Several special projects active during fiscal year 1971 were designed to reach, motivate, and instruct persons in culturally and linguistically isolated groups. Among these projects were those conducted under groups to Navajo Community College in Chinle, Arizona; to Skill Advancement, Inc., New York City, for work oriented instruction, mainly of the Carribean Spanish-speaking; to the Public Schools of the District of Columbia for the Educational Organization for Latin-Americans; to the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc., for a systems approach to meeting the educational needs of Mexican Americans; and to the Unified School Districts of Los Angeles City and San Jose (California) for family-based programs offering basic education in contexts and in content areas useful to Mexican Americans.

In fiscal year 1972 approximately 40 special projects will include those designed to meet uniquely adult instructional needs, those that employ a comprehensive approach to working with the disadvantaged, and those directed toward a clientele with special needs, such as the handicapped. Projects to meet adult needs would include efforts to define and measure Adult Performance Level (success as measured in practical instead of academic terms) and programs to meet practical goals through ABE instruction, such as in a career education program. Projects as part of a career education program would also be engaged in a "comprehensive approach," as would project conducted cooperatively with the Model Cities program and with TREND. "Special needs" projects might include, for example, those to develop sound instructional techniques for teaching the emotionally disturbed or the aurally handicapped, as well as the geographically and culturally isolated. Such projects might also include those to aid adult non-readers as part of the Right to Read effort.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Analysis of Seven Special Projects in Adult Basic Education (1969)

Other Sources of Information:

Evaluation reports from Special Projects

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Adult Education - Teacher Training

Legislation:

Adult Education Act of 1966
Title III, P.L. 91-230, Section 309(c)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History:

Year:	Authorization:	Appropriation:
1965		
1966	Authorization under EAO	$1,055,000
1967		1,399,838
1968	Section 304(a) of P.L. 91-230 provides that not less than 10% or more than 20% of total appropriation shall be reserved for the purposes of Section 309.	1,500,000
1969		2,000,000
1970		1,980,637
1971		3,000,000
1972		3,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Project grants are awarded to institutions of higher education, State or local educational agencies, or other public or private nonprofit agencies to promote and coordinate the training of personnel who work or are preparing to work in adult education. No matching funds are required. Expansion of the program is achieved through State and local workshops supported by State grant funds which provide preservice and inservice staff training and development for adult education personnel.

Program Effectiveness:

The limited resources of this program have been used to emphasize coordination, sensitizing adult education personnel to the unique needs of adults and to introduce new materials and techniques for instruction. Some programs are specifically designed for training bilingual teachers for special population groups. Generally data is available only in terms of participants and there are no clear measures to assess quality of the programs. In FY 1971, 2,800 participated in summer institute programs and follow-up supportive activities carried out in the local site.

A major redirection in the training of personnel for adult education programs was made in fiscal year 1971 with a shift of emphasis to regional planning and coordination of the teacher training programs. The regional program developed by the Southern Regional Education Board resulted in a closer working relationship between State departments, universities and local operational personnel and will reach approximately 7,800 local teachers in region IV. The university components are self-supporting or will be able to provide training from State resources after a 3-year time period. State agencies developed staff development plan which identified the training experiences required by State and local personnel. Both on-campus and off-campus courses are provided as well as workshops and preservice and inservice training. Twenty-two universities, including eight predominantly Negro institutions, have established graduate degree programs as a result of the regional model.

Based on the results of the regional development program in region IV and utilizing the experience gained in this program, the 1972 funds will be focused on the development and adaptation of such programs in the other nine regions. These nine projects will be directed toward regional adult education personnel needs and will require a total of approximately $2,500,000 of adult education teacher training funds for the first year of funding. The projects will continue for three years, after which time they will be sustained by State and institutional funds. The remaining 1972 teacher training funds available (approximately $500,000) will support three additional teacher training grants.

All of the projects funded in fiscal year 1972 will be directed toward the adult education teacher training objectives which will include training teachers to teach paraprofessionals who in turn will provide individualized instruction to undereducated adults; the development of adult education personnel for ethnic and special population groups; and the training of surplus elementary and secondary teachers to become adult education personnel.

These twelve grants in cooperation with approximately fifty participating institutions of higher education will provide training for 3,400 teachers and paraprofessionals for adult education programs in fiscal year 1972.

The nine regional professional development programs funded in fiscal year 1972 will continue in fiscal year 1973 in the second year of operation. Institutes will be held to train trainers of adult education reading teachers. The trainers will be employed to conduct orientation training pre-service and in-service education workshops for new adult education teachers, thereby increasing the multiplier effect of the training program.

It is estimated that 12 grantees in cooperation with approximately 50 participating institutions of higher education will provide training for 3,400 teachers and para-professionals for adult education programs in fiscal year 1973. The objectives outlined for fiscal year 1972 will continue in fiscal year 1973.

Emphasis will be given toward training bilingual teachers for special population groups who need to learn English as a second language and recruiting surplus elementary and secondary teachers to retrain as adult education personnel.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Information:

Reports from Training Institutions

No formal evaluation of this program has been undertaken.

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA)

Legislation:

Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1972

Funding History:

(Appropriations for MDTA)
(are made to the Department)
(of Labor. Funds are transferred)
(to DHEW for institutional)
(training.)

Total Federal obligations for institutional training including allowances paid trainee:

1965	$249,348,000
1966	281,710,000
1967	215,588,000
1968	221,847,000
1969	213,505,000
1970	256,071,000
1971	276,767,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor jointly administer programs authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act. These programs are aimed at reducing the level of unemployment, offsetting skill shortages, and enhancing the skills and productivity of the Nation's work force. The major tool used is education and training of those who are out of a job or are working at less than their full potential.

Under the Act the Secretary of Labor must assess the need for training, select the trainees, provide allowances and other training benefits, and help trainees get jobs. He is also responsible for job-development programs and experimental and demonstration projects, and for working with employers to develop on-the-job training (OJT).

Contracting for institutional training is a responsibility of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Institutional training, carried on in classrooms, shops, and laboratories, focuses primarily on skill training. It also includes the basic literacy, improved communication and computation skills, counseling, and preemployment orientation needed to make the enrollee employable.

Institutional training coupled with OJT projects is a further responsibility of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as is institutional training offered to residents of redevelopment areas, communities which are severely depressed economically and the instructional aspects of experimental and demonstration projects, as well as MDTA training in correctional institutions.

Most training programs are operated through State agreements. Training is provided through public educational agencies or private institutions. The State Agency is paid not more than 90% of the cost to the State for carrying out the agreement.

Program Effectiveness:

The MDTA institutional training program appears to be generally effective in providing training and services to unemployed and underemployed adults according to national data and a series of evaluation studies jointly developed and administered by the U.S. Office of Education and the Department of Labor.

MDTA trainees are out-of-school unemployed or underemployed persons -- in fiscal year 1971 over 65% were considered to be seriously disadvantaged, two-thirds had been unemployed over 15 weeks during the past year, 49 percent had not finished high school, 44 percent belonged to a minority race, 41 percent were under age 22, 8 percent were over 44 and 12 percent were handicapped.

Since the beginning of the MDTA program in August of 1962, 1,134,000 persons have been enrolled in the institutional training program, 75 percent completed their training objective and 75 percent of those completing secured employment. Part of the remaining 25 percent were called into the armed forces, some returned to full-time school, and others withdrew from the labor force.

In fiscal year 1970, 85,000 trainees completed institutional training and 62,000 (73 percent) had secured employment and were still on the job when last contacted.

First time enrollments:

1963	32,000
1964	68,600
1965	145,300
1966	177,500
1967	150,000
1968	140,000
1969	135,000
1970	130,000
1971	155,600

Training has been conducted in over 300 different occupational skills ranging from accounting clerk to x-ray technician. Clerical occupations comprise the largest group, almost 10 percent of the total enrollments.

Employed graduates of fiscal year 1970 reporting both pretraining and posttraining earnings experienced a 28 percent increase in median wage following training. Their average hourly wage rate rose from $1.67 to $2.14.

Persons in correctional institutions:-- A study of several institutions showed that recidivism is significantly lower among those persons who had manpower training than those among the prison population as a whole. Those who did return to prison were returned for less serious offenses, such as parole violations.

In fiscal year 1971, 5,275 prisoners were enrolled in programs operated in 54 Federal State and local institutions located in 34 States at a total HEW cost of $5,545,000.

MDTA Skills Center Study:

A study of 19 skills centers identified skills center strengths and weaknesses. In most areas skills centers are the sole institutions both capable and willing to provide disadvantaged adults with skill training, supported by remedial education, related education, counseling and other related services. Innovating techniques such as open-entry, open-exit, the cluster approach to skill training and individualized instruction have been applied previously in some vocational schools but not specifically adapted to the disadvantaged.

There is a good deal of evidence that skills centers have helped bring about change in existing vocational educational institutions, the report concludes. For example, the Denver Community College was built around the skills center concept, even to the extent of open-entry, open-exit for all courses. Skills centers have helped develop a management and instructional staff who have expert knowledge in providing training and manpower services to the disadvantaged and have provided increaseing opportunities for minority counselors and management personnel. Further, skills centers have demonstrated that it is possible to train individuals with entry level skills in a considerably shorter period of time than in most vocational institutions.

Weakness identified in the study include: (1) Skills centers were designed specifically to serve the disadvantaged, yet in carrying out that design, sponsors are open to the charge of establishing a segregated educational system. (2) Skills centers are subject to year-to-year appropriations, and are affected by changing federal priorities. The result is that organized planning and budgeting is impossible, funds available for capital outlay and facility acquisition are inadequate, and all staff operates in an atmosphere of insecurity. (3) The concept of reasonable expectation of employment is the major reason for the limited range of skills center offerings.

Quality and Relevance Evaluation Study:

This study took place in 12 labor markets and included both skills center and non skills center training programs. In summary, the contractors reported that the program's completion rates were lower than should be acceptable for a federally funded program (about two-thirds of the enrollees entering a program completed it). In the areas surveyed "only approximately one-third of the trainees entering the program are recorded as having obtained jobs related to the training at the time of separation of the program." While other studies indicate that the number of trainees who do get jobs are much greater, the contractor felt that it was significant that at the time of program termination this number was very low. The quality of the training itself, both occupational skills and basic education was found to be high and to provide those skills needed to meet job requirements.

Systems Analysis of the MDTA Institutional Training:

The study covered program management at the national level and a field study of the ten regional offices of the Department of Labor and the Office of Education and MDTA institutional training operations in 12 States. The study discusses the major program weaknesses and strengths within the complex administrative structure. General strengths reported: (1) The program is accomplishing its mission. (2) Institutional training enrollment has, over time, exceeded the number of trainee opportunities authorized. (3) The program has been innovative but improved methods of research utilization would expedite and widen its utility. (4) The use of federal excess property is providing valuable program support. Other comments related to its good allowance funding and controls and the good reputation of the program in the field. Weaknesses involve: overestimation of costs, delays in planning, start up and close out, deferred enrollment, inflexibility in project approval controls, dropouts and lack of management information.

Program develpment workshops -- About 1200 educational administrators in 10 HEW regions were brought together in workshops to expand the training of additional workers needed for environmental control. Each workshop identified their major causes of environmental deterioration, a list was developed of the kinds of workers most critically needed. These workshops have stimulated agencies to develop new training programs in technical institutes, junior colleges and other institutions.

Area Manpower Institutes for the Development of Staff (AMIDS) -- About 97,000 instructors, counselors, and administrators have been provided inservice training by AMIDS to acquaint manpower personnel with the special needs of the disadvantaged. AMIDS also supplied staff and technical assistance for personnel from over 50 other agencies dealing directly with the disadvantaged. Beside staff development, AMIDS assisted in developing counseling and community services, teaching English as a second language, provision of basic education, and improvement of skill instruction. In 1972, the seven AMIDS sites are expected to provide assistance to about 100,000 personnel working in manpower-related programs.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Now in its 10th year, the Manpower Development and Training Act is undergoing an intensive evaluation. Separate but interrelated evaluations have appraised its administrative system, its relevance to the labor market and the functioning of its skills centers. The extent to which MDTA has contributed to alleviation of skill shortages is currently being explored as is the process of individual referrals of MDTA enrollees to public and private training institutions and the conduct of basic education in MDTA projects.

However, the critical question is "What difference does MDTA make to the employment and earning of those who enroll?" A nationwide study of 5,169 persons who exited MDTA projects either by completion or early termination during 1969 will be completed in February 1972. Preliminary findings are positive, indicating that participants have substantially increased their incomes.

Studies to be completed in 1972 include:

Manpower Development and Training Act Outcomes Study. Decision Making Information, February 1972.

Effectiveness of Institutional Manpower Training in Meeting Employers Needs in Skills Shortage Occupations. Olympus Research Corporation, May 1972.

Evaluation of Basic Education Programs Conducted Under MDTA Institutional Training Program. North American Rockwell Information Systems Company, June 1972.

A Study of Individual Referrals under MDTA. Olympus Research Corporation, June 1972.

Planned studies include a tie-up study using national data and data from the completed studies to provide a synthesis of evaluation findings, additional cost-effectiveness information and other documents of value to program administrators.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

A series of evaluation studies of the MDTA institutional training program have been jointly developed and administered by the U.S. Office of Education and the Department of Labor. These include:

a) Evaluation of Manpower Development and Training Skills Centers -- Olympus Research Corporation, February 1971.

b) Evaluation of the Relevance and Quality of Preparation Under the MDTA Institutional Training Program -- Mentec Corporation, May 1971.

c) An Analysis and Evaluation of MDTA Institutional Programs Systems and Practices -- North American Rockwell Information System Company, April 1971.

Other Sources of Information:

Annual State evaluation reports.

Annual manpower report of the Secretary of HEW to the Congress, 1963 to 1970, "Education and Training..."

"A National Attitude Study of Trainees in MDTA Institutional Programs" Gerald Gurin, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, August 1971.

Manpower Report of the President, annual 1963 to 1971.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS AND EFFECTIVENESS INFORMATION

D. HIGHER EDUCATION

Page

1. Educational Opportunity Grants Program 147
2. College Work-Study Program 150
3. Cooperative Education Program. .153
4. Guaranteed Student Loan Program. 155
5. National Defense Student Loan Program. 158
6. Upward Bound Program. 162
7. Educational Talent Search Program 166
8. Special Services for Disadvantaged Students 168
9. Strengthening Developing Institutions 170
10. Annual Interest Grants 172
11. Grants for Construction of Undergraduate Academic Facilities . 174
12. State Administration and Planning. 176
13. Foreign Language and Areas Centers, Research and Studies . . . 178
14. Fulbright-Hays Act 181
15. Community Service and Continuing Education Program 183
16. Land Grant Colleges and Universities 186
17. NDEA Fellowship Programs 188
18. EPDA, Part E Fellowships 194
19. EPDA, Part E Institutes 197

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Opportunity Grants Program

Legislation:

Higher Education Act of 1965, Title IV, 79 Stat. 1231; P.L. 89-329; as amended by P.L. 90-575, Title I, 82 Stat. 1017; and as amended by P.L. 91-95, 83 Stat. 143.

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1972

Funding History:

Year	Authorization*	Appropriation**
1966	$ 70,000,000	$ 58,000,000
1967	70,000,000	112,000,000 1/
1968	70,000,000	140,600,000 2/
1969	70,000,000	124,600,000
1970	125,000,000	164,600,000
1971	170,000,000	177,700,000 3/
1972	170,000,000	165,300,000 4/

*Plus such sums as may be necessary for other than initial year awards
**Fiscal Year appropriation for use in succeeding Fiscal Year
1/This appropriation was reduced by $1.8 million by the President's Cost Reduction Order.
2/This appropriation was reduced by $9 million by Cost Reducation Order.
3/This included $10 million from 1972 appropriation.
4/$10 million of this appropriation was "borrowed" for use in FY 1972.

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to provide, through institutions of higher education, educational opportunity grants to qualified high school graduates of exceptional financial need, who for lack of financial means of their own or of their families would be unable to obtain the benefits of higher education without such aid.

The Educational Opportunity Grants program (EOG) is implemented through allocations to participating institutions which award the monies to needy students. Allotments to States are based on the number of full-time higher education students in a State compared with the total such enrollment in the United States. Students may receive EOG awards for up to $1,000 per year. However, every grant must be matched by the institution from some other aid administered by the institution including the Federal Work-Study program and National Defense Student Loans. Graduate students are not eligible for EOG support.

Office of Education strategy for this program is to encourage institutions of higher education to target these student aid funds to the most financially needy students, while providing these students with a financial aid package enabling them to complete their higher education.

Program Effectiveness:

During Fiscal Year 1972, the EOG program included 2,200 participating institutions with a total of 297,300 students receiving grants. The average award per student during the year amounted to $580. One measure of demand for the program, amount of panel-approved requests from institutions participating in the program, shows that for FY 1972, panels approved $258,854,000 in institutional requests, as compared with an actual appropriation of $177,700,000. A recent evaluation of the EOG program conducted by the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University found the program to be achieving its primary goal of enabling students of exceptional financial need to obtain an education beyond high school. However, the evaluation also found that almost three-fifths of the institutions in the program reported that their EOG funding allocation for FY 1970 was inadequate. Seventy-two percent of the predominantly black schools, in which two-thirds of the students receive financial aid, reported inadequate funds. States which are funded at less than 70 percent of panel-approved requests had a disproportionately large share of schools in low income counties and public two-year institutions.

Recommendations in the final report completed by the Bureau of Applied Social Research included the following:

1. Modification of the State allocation formula to ensure channeling of funds to States with the greatest needs;
2. Immediate and substantial increase in the funding of the EOG program to meet the needs which have been generated by increasing numbers of schools in the program, reported increases in the number of low-income students entering college, and higher costs of attending college.

Recent proposed changes in the EOG program, included in pending legislation, would provide for a coordinated student aid system combining grants and work-study arrangements to be provided to students from lower income families. These new proposals seek to assure the availability of funds to every qualified student, to assure that Federal funds go first, and in the largest amounts, to the students who need them most, to assure that all students of equal need are treated alike, and to provide potential students with as accurate information as possible concerning the aid they can expect.

On-going and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Applied Social Research, The Federal Educational Opportunity Grant Program, A Status Report, Fiscal Year 1970, 1971.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION

Program Name:

College Work-Study Program

Legislation:

P.L. 88-452, Title I, (42 U.S.C. 2751), 78 Stat. 515; as amended by P.L. 89-329, Title IV, 79 Stat. 1249; as amended by P.L. 90-575, Title I, 82 Stat. 1028-1029

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1972

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation *
	1965	1/	$ 55,710,000
	1966	$ 129,000,000	99,123,000
	1967	165,000,000	134,100,000
	1968	200,000,000	139,900,000
	1969	225,000,000	139,900,000
	1970	275,000,000	152,460,000
	1971	320,000,000	158,400,000 2/
	1972	320,000,000 3/	401,000,000 4/

* Up until FY 1972, the CWS Fiscal Year appropriation was used to fund program operations during the calendar year. With FY 1972, the program became one full year forward-funded.

1/ The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorized a lump sum of $412,500,000 for three youth programs including College Work-Study.

2/ Actual funds available for CWS in this year amounted to $199,700,000, including reprogrammed funds.

3/ Based on Section 404 of P.L. 90-247 (as amended).

4/ Includes $244,600,000 forward funding for FY 1973. A total of $237,400,000 was available for FY 1972.

Program Purpose and Operation:

The main object of the College Work-Study program (CWS) is to promote the part-time employment of students, particularly those from low-income families. Employment may be made available only to those students who need earnings to pursue a course of study at an eligible college or university. Employment may be for the institution itself (except in the case of a proprietary institution of higher education), or for a public or private nonprofit organization. Students may work up to an average of fifteen hours per week during a semester or other term when their classes are in session. Employment during vacation periods, such as the summer, may be as high as 40 hours per week.

Grants are made to higher education institutions for partial reimbursement of wages paid to students. Since August, 1968, these Federal grants cover 80 percent of the student wages, with the remainder to be paid by the institution, the employer of the student, or some other donor.

Two percent of each year's appropriation is reserved for Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The rest is allotted among the 50 States and the District of Columbia on the basis of the number of each, compared with the total in all 51 states, of (a) full-time higher education students, (b) high school graduates, and (c) related children under 18 years of age living in families with incomes of less than $3,000. Allocations to institutions within a State are based on approved applications.

Office of Education strategy for this program is to encourage institutions of higher education to target these students aid funds to the most financially needy students, while providing these students with a financial aid package enabling them to complete their higher education. The CWS program has encouraged institutions to increase the number of off-campus public service jobs available to students participating in the program.

Program Effectiveness:

Data on the effectiveness of this program come from program files and indicate that demand is not being filled. During program calendar year 1971, approximately 2,500 institutions of higher education participated in the CWS program, enabling some 430,000 students to find part-time employment. The average annual student wage, including the institutional matching share, amounted to an estimated $525 per student. One measure of demand for the program, amount of panel-approved requests from institutions participating in the program, shows that for FY 1972, panels approved $305,707,000 in institutional requests, as compared with $237,400,000 actually available for distribution to the schools.

Recent proposed changes in the CWS program, included in pending legislation, would provide for a coordinated student aid system combining work-study arrangements and grants to be targeted to students from lower income families. These new proposals seek to assure the availability of funds to every qualified student, to assure that Federal funds go first, and in the largest amounts, to the students who need them most, to assure that all students of equal need are treated alike, and to provide potential students with as accurate information as possible concerning the aid they can expect. It has also been recommended that the State allotment system for distibution of program funds be eliminated. For the CWS program specifically, it has also been proposed that all funds appropriated for the program be made available for two fiscal years, rather than just the funds reallotted as is presently the practice.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The CWS program is under study by the Bureau of Applied Social Research of Columbia University. The final report is due in June, 1972.

Sources of Evaluation Studies:

Factbook. Bureau of Higher Education. January, 1972.

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Cooperative Education Program

Legislation:

P.L. 90-575, Title I, 82 Stat. 1030, (20 U.S.C. 1087b) included in the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended, Title IV, Part C

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1972

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	*	$ 1,540,000
	1971	*	1,600,000
	1972	$ 1,700,000	1,700,000

* One percent of the College Work-Study appropriation was authorized to be used in support of cooperative education programs at higher education institutions.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Under this program, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to award grants for the planning, establishment, expansion or carrying out of cooperative education programs in higher education institutions. Cooperative education is defined as alternate periods of full-time study and full-time public or private employment related to a student's academic course of study.

The objective of the cooperative education program is to increase the number of opportunities for students at institutions to obtain career education. Federal support for such programs at colleges and universities is designed to encourage institutions which do not have such programs to determine the feasibility of establishing them. Other institutions which have planned for such programs and desire to implement them may use grant funds for this purpose, and those which plan to expand or strengthen existing programs may receive support.

Under the Cooperative Education program, grants are awarded to institutions on a proposal basis, with an institution eligible to receive grants for three years. Awards cannot exceed $75,000, and funds must not be used as compensation for student employment. The student work experience must closely correlate with and enrich their on-campus experiences. Employers of students pay them commensurate with their productivity and the extent to which they are capable of assuming job responsibilities. In many instances the compensation students receive while employed is their major source of support in continuing and completing their academic programs. The institutions of higher education assume the responsibility for assigning the student to a job relevant to his academic program and providing supervision during the work period. In addition, the student's job performance is evaluated by the institution. In many cases academic credit is given for the work experience, and in others the kind and extent of work experience is recorded on the transcript. Salaries and other administrative expenses for cooperative education administrators are payable from grant funds.

Program Effectiveness:

This is a new program which has not been evaluated and for which data are available only from program files. In FY 1971, 91 institutions of higher education received grants totaling $1.6 million. Included are programs at institutions located in Appalachia and the inner-city ghettos as well as those addressing the special needs of veterans and the handicapped. Awards for 1971 supported cooperative programs at 46 predominately black institutions and 12 programs supported with Federal funds enrolled a substantial number of American Indians and Spanish-speaking students.

The support for the program can be measured to some extent by the number of applications and requested amounts for FY 1970 and FY 1971. In FY 1970, the program received 206 applications requesting 8.5 million dollars. In FY 1971, 344 institutions requested 12.3 million dollars.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Factbook. Bureau of Higher Education. January 1972.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Guaranteed Student Loan Program

Legislation:

Title IV-B, Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended; Public Law 89-329
Emergency Insured Student Loan Act of 1969; Public Law 91-95.

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1972

Funding History:

Year	Loan Volume	Obligations 1/	Appropriation 1/
1966	$ 77,443,000 2/	$ --	$ 10,450,000 2/
1967	248,494,000 2/	15,632,000 2/	44,800,000 2/
1968	435,800,000 2/	39,924,000 2/	43,600,000 2/
1969	686,784,000 2/	62,595,000 2/	74,900,000
1970	839,666,000	112,461,000	62,400,000
1971	1,043,991,000	143,154,000	143,200,000
1972	1,160,000,000	199,571,000	196,600,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of the Program is to provide low-interest, deferred repayment loans for students attending nearly 4,000 eligible institutions of higher education and nearly 3,500 vocational, technical, business and trade schools.

The principal of the loan is provide by participating lending institutions such as commercial banks, savings and loan association, credit unions, insurance companies, pension funds, and eligible educational institutions. The loan is guaranteed by a State or private non-profit agency or insured by the Federal government.

Loan programs are equally divided between those insured by States and reinsured (80 percent) by the Federal government and those directly insured by the Federal government. A student, however, is elibible if he is enrolled and in good standing or accepted for enrollment at least half time at an eligible institution and is a United States national or is in the United States for other than a temporary purpose. The maximum loan per academic year is $1,500 with a maximum aggregate outstanding of $7,500 per individual. If the student's adjusted family income is less than $15,000, the Federal government will pay the total interest on the loan until repayment begins and during authorized periods of deferment.

1/ Includes advances for reserve funds--excludes computer cost other than administrative expenses, and default payments under the student Loan Insurance Fund.

2/ Includesloans primarily carried under Vocational Education

The student pays the total interest at an annual percentage rate of 7% during repayment which begins 9-12 months after graduation or withdrawal from school. Deferments are allowed for return to school as a full-time student and up to three years for military service, Peace Corps, or VISTA.

A special allowance is authorized to be paid to lenders when the Secretary determines that economic conditions are impeding or threatening to impede the fulfillment of the purposes of the Program or that the return to the lender is less than equitable. The rate which is determined quarterly, may not exceed 3% per annum on the average unpaid balance of loans made after August 1, 1969.

Program Objective:

The Guaranteed Student Loan Program is designed to make low-cost, deferred repayment loans available to all who are studying at least half-time regardless of family income. A major test of its effectiveness, therefore, is whether it serves a broad group of students and whether demand for this unique type of loan has been increasing proportionate with other forms of student aid. The GSL Program appears to have broad appeal, measured by income category, age and status of borrower, race and sex. Of all borrowers enrolled in 1970-71, 28.7% are from families with gross incomes of less than $6,000 while 32.4% are from families with gross income of $12,000 and over. 62.1% of the borrowers are in the normal undergraduate age range of 18-23 but 34.5% are in the 24-35 age group, indicating substantial use of guaranteed loans by graduate students and adults resuming their education. The distribution of loans by academic status is 57.6% for freshmen - sophmore students, and 38.3% for upperclassmen and graduate students. 9.2% of borrowers are black even though blacks constitute only 6.9% of the total undergraduate population. Nearly 2 out of three borrowers are male, about the same proportion of males as found in the total undergraduate population.

Another indicator of the program's appeal is the broad participation by different types of lenders. Nationally chartered banks comprise about one-third of the lenders while 44.6% of the lenders are State banks. A rapidly increasing number of mutual savings banks, savings and loan institutions and credit unions are becoming eligible lenders.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Lybrand, Ross Bros., and Montgomery conducted an evaluation of customer discrimination practices in December - January of 1969-70. This study included an extensive student data questionnaire, the results of which are not yet fully analyzed.

The HEW FAST Task Force has been conducting a continuing evaluation of the management structure and operation of the program.

Each year, the General Accounting Office audits the Student Loan Insurance fund. In addition, in December of 1971, they issued a report on claims and collections practices.

The HEW Audit Agency has issued a draft report based on a two year study of the program. The Office of Management and Budget is evaluating the program.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Survey of Guaranteed Student Loan Accessibility
OE contract number OEC-0-70-1669, February 1970, Lybrand, Ross Bros., and Montgomery

Insured Loans Division Management Report
August 1971, HEW FAST Task Force

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

National Defense Student Loan Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date
National Defense Education Act of 1958, Title II, Public Law 85-864, as amended	June 30, 1972

Funding History:	Year	Authorization *	Appropriation **
	1966	$ 179,300,000	$ 181,550,000
	1967	190,000,000	192,000,000
	1968	225,000,000	193,400,000
	1969	210,000,000	193,400,000
	1970	325,000,000	194,687,000
	1971	375,000,000	243,000,000
	1972	375,000,000	293,000,000

* Authorization for contribution to loan funds only. In addition, a total of $25,000,000 was authorized for loans to institutions from Fiscal Year 1959 through the duration of the Act.

** Appropriation includes contributions to loan funds, loans to institutions and Federal payments to repay the institutional share of cancellations.

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of the Program is to fund postsecondary institutions for the purpose of making long-term, low-interest loans to students with financial need. Such loans complement other forms of student financial assistance such as educational opportunity grants, college work-study, and insured student loans. Because of the long term repayment period, students can repay even maximum NDS loans with little burden on current income. Because the interest on the loan is subsidized while the student is in school, and accrues at a rate of only 3 percent during the repayment period, the student's total repayment is never more than about 120 percent of the total original loan.

Funding is initially allocated to States by means of a special allotment formula. Funding levels for institutions within each State are decided by regional review panels consisting of OE Program Officers from the regional and national offices and financial aid officers selected from institutions in that region. Panel approved requests are generally for an excess of the annual allocation for NDSL for a State. The result is that individual institutions within a State receive an identifical percentage of their approved request as an allocation. Institutions often distribute NDS loans in conjunction with other forms of financial aid and financial aid officers hold different views of how to "package" these various aid components. Undergraduates may borrow up to $1,000 a year. Graduate and professional students may borrow up to $2,500 a year. Total undergraduate NDSL indebtedness must not exceed $5,000, while the aggregate loans of a graduate or professional student must not exceed $10,000 for all years. Upon leaving the institution, students sign a repayment agreement which specifies the duration, interest rate and amount of repayment. After a nine months grace period following cessation of studies, the student begins repayments (at least quarterly) over a ten year period or less at his option. The ten year repayment period may be deferred when the borrower completes up to three years of service with Vista, the Peace Corps, or military service. A student completing his course of studies, and qualifying for maximum loan deferral, would not begin repaying his final year loan until four years and six months after receiving such loan and would not complete repayment of that loan until fourteen years, six months after the initial receipt of loan. In the instance of a freshman borrowing and later attending graduate school for three years, plus full deferral, the repayments will not begin until ten and one-half years after receipt of initial loan and repayments would not be completed until twenty and one-half years after receipt of such loan. The average repayment period for loans now fully closed out is about seven years, reflecting the small number of students who borrow over the maximum duration and/or who make full use of the deferral provisions. Another feature of the program's operation is the cancellation privilege offered borrowers who later become teachers. Those who teach in specifically designated low income schools or schools for handicapped children, may have 15 percent of their loans cancelled for each year of teaching, up to a total cancellation of the loan. Borrowers teaching in other schools may have loans cancelled at a 10 percent rate. As of July 1, 1970, loans may be cancelled at the 12-½ percent for each year of military service up to a total of 4 years.

Program Effectiveness:

The effectiveness of the NDSL Program can best be measured by (1) the extent to which total demand for this type of loan is actually met; and (2) the extent to which the average amount of loan is adequate for the individual borrower relative to the cost of his education and the proportion of NDS loans to other forms of student financial aid. This latter criterion is partially circumscribed by the total amount which an individual can borrow each year ($1000) and by the relationship between the total NDSL funds available to the institution and the total number of students applying for loans. Thus, the effectiveness of the

Program depends partly upon more fully satisfying the total demand for this type of loan, but, also, upon the "packaging" practices which determine the average amount of loans at each institution.

Presently, loan applications from institutions are about 30 percent in excess of final panel-approved amounts. Panel-approved amounts have typically exceeded actual Program appropriations by about 40 percent. Since institutional requests are typically inflated to correct for expected panel reductions, such requests are not an accurate measure of need. However, since institutional requests are partly formulated with reference to prior year funding, it is equally possible that such requests understate real need.

The NDSL Program had provided, cumulatively, loans to 455,800 through FY 1970. The average amount of loan was $630. Below is a comparison of growth rates in total appropriations, new students served, and average loan amount for the five year period ending FY 1970.

Year	Total Appropriations	New Borrowers	Average Loan
1966	23.8%	15.9%	2.8%
1967	5.4	- .8%	-1.2
1968	.5	-5.8	-7.1
1969	0	17.1	3.6
1970	1.0	10.9	16.6
	6.1%	7.5	4.1%

Allowing for year-to-year fluctuations, the Program's annual appropriations grew faster than enrollments and the number of new borrowers expanded more rapidly than Program appropriations. One result of this was that the size of the average NDS loan grew less rapidly than either of these other two measures.

The rapid expansion of the Insured Student Loan Program ("Guaranteed Loans") indicates total loan demand many times that of the NDSL Program appropriation. This suggests that the total number of NDSL borrowers might be significantly expanded. However, the average amount of loan would not increase much beyond $750 because of the large number of borrowers attending low-cost public institutions.

A main criterion for program effectiveness is the proportion of NDSL loans going to lower income students. 77 percent of NDS loans are made to borrowers whose parents' income is below $9000. Since Program effectiveness is partially defined by its service to lower-income groups, it is clear that the NDSL Program effectively reaches this group. In addition, we might assume that an additional 30 percent of those whose family income is less than $9000 have an additional need of an NDS loan to supplement the lack of more grant/work aid. The number of new borrowers would therefore expand to about 593,000. If we further assume that the average NDS loan will not exceed $700, the total current demand for NDS loans (FY 72 data) should be about $415 million. These assumptions ignore the residual of students not attending college because no NDSL loans are available and the large numbers of students in the over $9000 category for whom NDS loans might be substituted for other forms of aid. Also ignored is the fact that the NDSL program has been extended to vocational and proprietary institutions with large numbers of potential borrowers. If, taking these into account, we expand borrowers by 99,000 new borrowers, the total required funds at an average loan of $700 would be $478 million.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation study conducted by Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey, is scheduled for completion in June, 1972.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Factbook. Bureau of Higher Education. January 1972.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Upward Bound Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Act of 1965. Title IV-A Section 408; Public Law 89-329; as amended by Public Law 90-575; as amended by Public Law 91-230.	June 30, 1972

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	*	*
	1966	*	*
	1967	*	*
	1968	*	*
	1969	*	*
	1970	$29,600,000[1]	$29,600,000
	1971	30,061,000[1]	30,061,000
	1972	32,669,000[1]	32,669,000

*There were no specific authorizations or appropriations for Upward Bound during these years. This was an OEO agency allocation made from the total appropriations of Title II-A of the Economic Opportunity Act.

[1] Represents budget authority. Beginning in FY 1970 funds authorized were combined for the three programs of Special Services, Upward Bound, and Talent Search.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Upward Bound is designed for the low-income high school student who, without the program, would not have considered college enrollment nor would he have been likely to have gained admission to and successfully completed a two- or four-year college. In a typical year an Upward Bound student is a resident on a college, university or secondary school campus for a six- to eight-week summer session. In the academic year he may attend Saturday classes or tutorial/counseling sessions or participate in cultural enrichment activities. During his junior and senior years he explores many options for the postsecondary preparation and program best suited to his needs.

Upward Bound looks for the individual who has a demonstrated aptitude for a career which demands higher education but whose faulty preparation prevents him from meeting conventional criteria for admission to a college, university or technical institute. It is designed to repair the faulty preparation by means of remedial instruction, altered curriculum, tutoring, cultural exposure and encouragement so that the goal of Upward Bound, admission and success in higher education, can be achieved.

Upward Bound programs must include cooperative arrangements among one or more colleges and universities and secondary schools. High school students enrolled in these programs receive stipends of up to $30 per month. Federal financial assistance for these programs may not exceed 80 percent of the total or $1,440 per student.

The Upward Bound program is in operation (summer 1971 and academic year 1971-72) at 299 colleges, universities and a select number of residential secondary schools. This includes 27 new projects plus 272 renewals from the previous year.

Programs include (1) coordination, where feasible, of Talent Search, Upward Bound, and Special Services for Disadvantaged Students; (2) increased attention to students in cultural and geographic isolation; (3) projects to overcome motivational and academic barriers to acceptance at and success in a two- or four-year college.

Program Effectiveness:

The latest available Census data (1969) reveals that there are about 1,800,000 students in the tenth to twelfth grades from poor families (less than $3,000 family income), and near-poor families (less than $5,000 family income). These 1,800,000 students constitute the upper limit of the Upward Bound target population. Census data also show that for the high school graduates of this poor and near-poor income group who were 18 to 24 years old in 1970, about 40 percent had entered college by October 1970.

About 60 percent of all high school graduates are now entering college. This rate includes the many high school graduates who enter college later than the same year of high school graduation ("delayed entrants") as well as the slightly over half of all high school graduates who enter college in the year of high school graduation. Therefore, if low-income high school graduates (up to $5,000 family income) are to enroll in college at the same rate as all high school graduates, an additional 20 percent of low-income quartile high school graduates must complete high school and enroll in college. Since about 40 percent of the low-income quartile students enter college on their own, Upward Bound must concentrate on attracting the 20 percent who are not to obtain national parity. This 20 percent of the 1,800,000 low-income tenth to twelfth graders constitutes, therefore, the target population of Upward Bound. Upward Bound, consequently, must get about 360,000 (.20 X 1,800, 000) of these tenth to twelfth grade students through high school and into college if the college entrance rate for high school graduates from families with incomes below $5,000 is to equal the college entrance rate for all families.

Enrollment in the Upward Bound program for the years 1968 to 1960 ranged from 8,034 to 9,523. A complete program listing for the period follows.

UPWARD BOUND COLLEGE ENROLLMENT

	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	TOTALS
Total Upward Bound Graduates	856	4940	9523	8034	8702	32,055
Initially Reported Enrolled	672 (78.5%)	3607 (73.0%)	6679 (70.1%)	5907 (73.5%)	6703 (77.0%)	23,568 (73.5%)
Actually Enrolled	605 (70.7%)	3329 (67.4%)	6242 (65.5%)	5351 (66.6%)	5877 (67.5%)	21,404 (66.8%)
Enrolled Technical Institute or Commercial School	4 (.5%)	180 (3.6%)	451 4.7%)	331 4.1%)	311 3.6%)	1,277 4.0%)
Other Post-Secondary Activities: Military service, em- employment, marriage, etc.	247 (28.9%)	1431 (29.0%)	2830 (29.7%)	2352 (29.3%)	2514 (28.9%)	9,374 (29.2%)

From the above chart it can be seen that enrollment of the Upward Bound students exceeded the national mean of .40 for low income quartile students.

A number of studies of the Upward Bound program have been completed. The most recent evaluation by Greenleigh Associates found:

1. Upward Bound students are generally representative of the academically underachieving and economically disadvantaged youth in America.
2. The Upward Bound program is an effective dropout prevention program as well as a channel to college.
3. College retention rates of Upward Bound graduates are equal to or greater than thenational average.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluations:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 222, "School Enrollment: October 1970." derived from tables 14 and 15, and unpublished data obtained from the Bureau of the Census.

UPWARD BOUND 1965-69: A History and Synthesis of Data on the Program in the Office of Economic Opportunity, February 1970, Greenleigh Associates, New York, N.Y.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Talent Search Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Act of 1965. Title IV-A, Section 408, Public Law 89-329; as amended by Public Law 90-575; as amended by Public Law 91-230.	June 30, 1972

Funding History:	Year:	Authorization:	Appropriation:
	1966	1/	$ 2,000,000
	1967	1/	2,500,000
	1968	1/	4,000,000
	1969	$ 4,000,000	4,000,000
	1970	5,000,000	5,000,000
	1971	5,000,000	5,000,000
	1972	5,000,000	5,000,000

1/ Such sums as may be necessary.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Talent Search is project grant program which works through institutions of higher education, and public and private non-profit agencies and organizations to provide services to low-income youth from the 7th through 12th grades. The ultimate goal of this program is to equalize educational opportunities for low-income students through: (1) identification and encouragement of qualified youth of financial or cultural need; (2) publication of existing forms of student financial aid; and (3) encouragement of secondary-school or college dropouts of demonstrated aptitude to reenter educational programs including post-secondary school programs.

The Commissioner may enter into contracts with or award grants to institutions of higher education, combinations of institutions of higher education, and public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations (including professional and scholarly associations). In addition, he may enter into contracts with public and private agencies. Grants and contracts are limited to $100,000 per year and funding selections are made on the basis of program proposals submitted by eligible parties on or before a date set by the Commissioner.

Program Effectiveness:

According to the latest available Census data, there are about 5,100,000 young people between the ages of 13 to 21 who are poor or near-poor. This group is made up of 3,600,000 young people from families of less than $3,700 income, and 1,500,000 young people from families with an annual income from $3,700 to $4,700. These groups constitute the upper limit, or the target population for the Talent Search program.

There are, however, a large number of newly released veterans who need the services of Talent Search. Coupled with high unemployment rates among the 800,000 to 1,000,000 servicemen who return to Civilian life each year is an education pattern reflected in the following statistics:

> 20 to 25% of Vietnam veterans have had less than a high school level of education; 15% have completed some college work.
>
> 20 to 25% of Vietnam veterans received combat training only and are returning to civilian life inadequately prepared to take employment.

In 1971-72, Talent Search is directing services to more of these veterans.

During academic year 1970-71 (fiscal year 1970), services were provided to 143,000 young people from the grades 7 through 12. A total of 25,891 were placed in post-secondary education compared with an academic year 1969-70 placement figure of 23,258. In addition, 2,571 dropouts were persuaded to return to school and 2,047 enrolled in high school equivalency programs. Through Talent Search efforts, another 2,831 gained employment. There were 192 proposals requesting $11 million in fiscal year 1971. Ninety projects were funded with the $5 million appropriation. It is estimated that 207,000 students will be aided.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program files.
U.S. Census, unpublished data.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Special Services for Disadvantaged Students

Legislation:

Higher Education Act of 1965. Title IV Part A Section 408; Public Law 89-329; as amended by Public Law 90-575; as amended by Public Law 91-95.

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1972

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1970	$ 10,000,000	$ 10,000,000
1971	15,000,000	15,000,000
1972	15,000,000	15,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Special Services is a project grant program making awards to institutions of higher education provide services to disadvantaged students.

The goal of this program is to provide remedial and other supportive services for students with academic potential who because of educational, cultural, or economic background, or physical handicap are in need of counseling, tutorial or other supportive services, career guidance and placement.

Program Effectiveness:

The latest Census data show that there were about 1,200,000 poor and near-poor (up to $5,000 family income) eleventh and twelfth grade high school students in October 1970. At least 65 percent (800,000) within the income group will be expected to graduate from high school, and at least 40 percent (320,000) of the high school graduates will be expected to enter college eventually. The 320,000 low-income students, plus those physically handicapped students from families above $5,000 income, constitute the upper limit of the target population in need of special services. More clearly defined statistics on the target population for this program will become available upon completion of the current study of special services programs in August 1972.

The program completed its first year of operation on June 30, 1971. An evaluation of federally supported and other special services programs is currently underway; results from this study will be available in the latter part of 1972. In FY 1971 185 projects were funded, at an average cost of $81,000 per project, serving 40,000 students. The average cost per student was about $375.00.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Southeastern Office of Educational Testing Service, Durham, North Carolina, is conducting an evaluation study which will be completed in August 1972.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program files.
U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 222, "School Enrollment: October 1970," derived from tables 14 and 15, and unpublished data obtained from the Bureau of the Census.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Strengthening Developing Institutions

Legislation: Expiration Date:

Higher Education Act of 1965, Title III; Public Law 89-329, as amended

June 30, 1972

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1966	$ 55,000,000	$ 5,000,000
	1967	30,000,000	30,000,000
	1968	55,000,000	30,000,000
	1969	35,000,000	30,000,000
	1970	70,000,000	30,000,000
	1971	91,000,000	33,850,000
	1972	91,000,000	51,850,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of the Program is to assist developing institutions of higher education in strengthening their academic, administrative, and student services programs so that they can become financially self-sustaining and can offer quality education to their students.

Two and four-year colleges which meet broad criteria for "developing" status may apply for funds with which to enter into cooperative arrangements with other colleges; and may apply for national reaching fellows or professors emeriti. Cooperative arrangements may involve an agreement with a developed "assisting" institution and with several other developing institutions in a consortium. Such arrangements may involve exchange of faculty or students, visiting scholars, faculty and administration inprovements, introduction of new curricula and curricular materials, and joint use of facilities such as libraries and laboratories. National Teaching Fellows and Professors Emeriti are selected by the grantee institutions.

Program Effectiveness:

Approximately 500 colleges are currently participating in Cooperative arrangements through Title III. About 200 individual programs are funded at these institutions. There were also about 550 National Teaching Fellowships awarded for FY 1971 and about 60 professors emeriti participated in and program. Of the 500 institutions funded, nearly all of the 112 predominately or historically Black colleges participate with 44.9 percent receiving grants. They received some what more than 60 percent of the total funds.

The total funding of the Program was not increased beyond the initial level of $30,000,000 until FY '71 and FY '72 when appropriations were $33.850 million in FY 71 to $51.850 million in FY '72. Institutional requests exceed Program appropriations by about 2.5 times.

Title III effectiveness is difficult to measure because measures of institutional quality are lacking and since even subjective data on some aspects of institutional progress may be too particular to support a general conclusion of overall development. Furthermore, many of the projects funded by the Program involve curriculum and teaching improvement, the spillover effects of which may noticeably strengthen the institution only over an extended period of time.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation conducted by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, is scheduled for completion in June 1972.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program files.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Annual Interest Grants

Legislation:

Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended 1968; Title III, Section 306; Public Law 88-204.

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1972

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1969	$ 5,000,000	$ 3,920,000
1970	11,750,000	11,750,000
1971	25,250,000	21,000,000
1972	38,750,000	29,010,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to reduce the cost to institutions of higher learning of obtaining private loans for construction purposes.

Loans obtained by institutions of higher education in amounts up to 90% of project development cost may be eligible for annual interest grant assistance. The annual grant made under this program covers the difference between annual debt service which would result from a 3 percent loan and the debt service actually obtained. Not more than 12 1/2 percent of the appropriation for the year may be used in any one State.

Program Effectiveness:

In FY 1971 352 grants totaling $14.5 million were approved to support approximately $600 million in construction loans. Forty four percent of the money went to private institutions, 20 percent to public community colleges, and 36 percent to public 4 year colleges and universities. The following table summarizes the output measures.

The program has been targeted to those institutions having the greatest need and serving the greatest number of disadvantaged students. It has not been completely successful. For example, in 1971 $1 million was reserved for black colleges but only $585,000 was used because of the inability of black colleges to arrange private financing. In general colleges with the greatest need for help (i.e. those with poor credit rating) are least able to avail themselves of the help provided in this program.

Costs involved pyramid and already have committed the government to $53,776,000 annually for the next 25 years.

Output Measures ($ in millions)	1971 Actual	1972 Estimate	1973 Estimate
Value of loans Subsidized	$ 600	$ 620	$ 400
Two-year schools	(150)	(150)	(155)
Colleges and Universities	(450)	(465)	(245)
Number of Grants	352	310	200
Number of Institutions Aided	291	257	165
Estimated Value of Construction Supported 1/	1,000	1,033	666

1/ Based on assumption that loans supported generally represent 60% of total project cost.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluations:

An evaluation of facilities' needs and program impact is planned for 1972.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Fact book: Bureau of Higher Education, January 1972.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Grants for Construction of Undergraduate Academic Facilities

Legislation:	Expiration Date
Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, as amended; Title I; Section 103, 104 Public Law 88-204; Public Law 89-329; Public Law 89-752; Public Law 90-575; 20 U.S.C. 701.	June 30, 1972

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	$ 230,000,000	$ 230,000,000
	1966	460,000,000	458,000,000
	1967	475,000,000	453,000,000
	1968	728,000,000	400,000,000
	1969	936,000,000	83,000,000
	1970	936,000,000	76,000,000
	1971	936,000,000	43,000,000
	1972	936,000,000	43,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to provide grants to higher education institutions to finance the construction, rehabilitation and improvement of undergraduate facilities.

Funds for public community colleges and public technical institutes under this program are allotted to each state by a formula based on the number of high school graduates and per capita income of residents. Funds for other institutions are allotted to each state by a formula based on the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education and the number of students in grades 9 through 12. Within each state federal grants may be awarded for up to 50 per cent of the project development cost. Twenty four per cent of funds appropriated under the Title are reserved for community and technical colleges and schools.

Assistance is not given for facilities for which admission is normally charged. It is also not given for facilities used for sectarian instruction nor for facilities for schools of the health professions as defined in the Higher Education Facilities Act. In addition, funds are not provided for residential, dining, and student union purposes.

The law requires each state to set up a state Commission for Higher Education Facilities. This Commission determines priorities and the federal share within the state for each project submitted.

Program Effectiveness:

Data on program effectiveness are available only from program files. In 1966 865 institutions of higher education were aided with Title I funds. Of these, 224 were public community colleges or technical schools. The grants which went to these institutions provided federal funding for 15,568,000 square feet of academic facilities to accommodate 103,786 students. From the peak year 1966 the number of grants made and number of square feet constructed have consistently decreased as the need for facilities has been met and federal resources have become scarce. Since the inception of the program, federal funds have supported the construction of 56,466,000 square feet of facilities.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation of facilities' needs and program impact is planned for 1972.

Sources of Education Data:

Factbook. Bureau of Higher Education. January 1972.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

State Administration and Planning

Legislation:

Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; as amended; Title I, Section 105; Public Law 88-204.

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1972

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	$ 3,000,000	$ 3,000,000
1966	2,000,000	2,000,000
1967	7,000,000 *	7,000,000
1968	7,000,000	7,000,000
1969	7,000,000	7,000,000
1970	7,000,000	6,000,000
1971	7,000,000	6,000,000
1972	7,000,000	6,000,000

* Higher Education Amendments of 1966 (PL 89-752), Sec. 3 not more than $3,000,000 may be expended in any fiscal year for the purpose of proper and efficient administration of State plans including such expenses which were necessary for the preparation of such plans.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 requires the establishment of State commissions to develop and to administer the State plan for the undergraduate facilities construction grants program. Grants are available to these commissions to cover the costs of administration of the state plans under this title, and the instructional equipment grant program under Part A of Title VI of the HEA. Under the Higher Education Amendments of 1966, grants are also available to the same commissions for comprehensive planning to study future facilities needs in higher education.

Each state desiring to participate under Title I of HEFA is required to designate an existing state agency or establish a new agency which is representative of the public and of institutions of higher education. The agency's plan for state participation must be approved by the Commissioner.

Using basic criteria prescribed by law the state agency determines the relative priorities of eligible projects for construction of academic facilities submitted by institutions of higher education within the state and determines the Federal share of the development cost of each such project.

. State commissions receive grants for conducting either directly or through other agencies comprehensive planning to determine construction needs of institutions of higher education in the state.

Program Effectiveness:

In FY 1971 54 state commissions participated in the program obligating $2.6 million for administration and $3.3 million for comprehensive planning. Since the inception of the Interest Subsidy Program in June 1970, the State commissions have assumed the responsibility of assisting institutions in filing applications. They also provide certain review functions on all applications prior to their submission to the Office of Education.

The funds for this program has resulted in a higher level of expertise in state agencies. This is evident from their annual reports to the Office of Education.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation of facilities' needs and program impact is planned for 1972.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Factbook. Bureau of Higher Education, January 1972.

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Foreign Language and Areas Centers, Research, and Studies

Legislation:

National Defense Education Act of 1958. Title VI; Public Law 85-864; as amended by Public Law 88-665; as amended by Public Law 90-575.

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1972

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1959	$ 8,000,000	$ 3,416,000
1960	8,000,000	7,300,000
1961	8,000,000	6,554,000
1962	8,000,000	8,000,000
1963	8,000,000	7,970,000
1964	8,000,000	8,000,000
1965	13,000,000	13,000,000
1966	14,000,000	14,000,000
1967	16,000,000	15,800,000
1968	18,000,000	15,700,000
1969	16,050,000	15,450,000
1970	30,000,000	12,850,000
1971	38,500,000	7,170,000
1972	38,500,000 1/	13,940,000
1973		13,930,000 est.

1/ Legislation pending

Program Purpose and Operation:

Programs for foreign language and area studies funded under this appropriation have four major purposes: (1) increase the nation's manpower pool of trained specialists in foreign language, area studies, and world affairs; (2) provide inservice training to upgrade and update the professional knowledge and skills of existing specialists in foreign language, area studies, and world affairs; (3) produce new knowledge about other nations and cultures, particularly those of the non-Western world, through research and development; and (4) develop improved curricula and effective instructional materials in foreign languages, area studies, and world affairs needed by education, government, and business.

The National Defense Education Act, Title VI, authorized the award of grants and contracts to U. S. educational institutions, organizations, and individuals for activities conducted primarily in the United States. Program assistance includes institutional development, fellowship support, and research in foreign language, area studies, world affairs, and intercultural understanding.

Program Effectiveness:

Data on program effectiveness are limited to those on program reach found in the files of the Office of Education.

106 foreign language and area studies centers at 63 U. S. institutions of higher education offered instruction in the languages and cultures of countries in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, Latin America, the U.S.S.R., and Eastern Europe to approximately 85,000 undergraduate and graduate students. The following table provides data on the world area distribution of National Defense Education Centers in fiscal year 1970, the most recent year for which complete data is available.

World Area	Number of Centers	Obligations	Total Enrollments
Eurasia 1/	23	$ 1,037,605	19,447
Eastern Asia 2/......	27	1,305,737	26,942
Latin America........	16	696,070	35,084
South and Southeast Asia	15	934,488	8,450
Africa.................	13	546,155	7,536
Middle East...........	12	632,912	11,517
Northwest Europe.......	1	32,035	545
Totals...........	107	$ 5,185,000	109,521

1/ Includes East European, Slavic, Ural-Atlaic and Sino-Soviet Centers.
2/ Includes General and East Asian Centers.

Fellowships were awarded to 769 graduate students planning careers in teaching or public service requiring a knowledge of modern foreign languages and related fields.

37 research contracts were awarded to produce new curricula and instructional materials, research on methods of teaching, and studies on international and intercultural education intended for use in schools and colleges throughout the U.S. The impact of this program is suggested by a recent materials utilization survey which provides specific data on instructional materials for 50 different languages in 82 foreign language and area studies programs. Results of the survey show, for example, that of 24 respondent institutions engaged in teaching Chinese; 21, or 88 percent were using materials produced under National Defense Education

Title VI support; of 17 programs offering instruction in Hindi, 100 percent were using National Defense Education materials; and 6 out of 7 Arabic programs similarly reported utilization of National Defense Education-supported materials.

An example of a widely used area studies textbook produced under this program is the publication in fiscal year 1971 of The African Experience, a comprehensive set of teaching materials. Prepared by the African Studies Center at Northwestern University, the work includes original essays by well-known scholars and current research and bibliographic references. The set has already been adopted by educators in approximately 70 colleges and 3 high school districts throughout the country. It is proving useful in training secondary school teachers as well as undergraduate and graduate students.

In fiscal year 1972, these programs will provide assistance for 106 foreign language and area studies centers, 27 intensive summer language programs, 6 new pilot graduate programs for research and training on contemporary issues and topics that cut across geographical regions, 10 new pilot undergraduate programs in international education. 2,200 graduate and undergraduate fellowships, and 33 research projects.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program files.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Fulbright - Hays Act

Legislation:

Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. Section 102 (b) (6); Public Law 87-256; as amended by Public Law 87-565; as amended by Public Law 89-698.

Expiration Date:

None

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1964	1/	$ 1,500,000
1965		1,500,000
1966		2,000,000
1967		3,000,000
1968		3,000,000
1969		3,000,000
1970		2,430,000
1971		830,000
1972		1,360,000

1/ Indefinite, does not require specific money authorization.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Programs for foreign language and area studies funded under this appropriation have four major purposes: (1) increase the nation's manpower pool of trained specialists in foreign language, area studies, and world affairs; (2) provide inservice training to upgrade and update the professional knowledge and skills of existing specialists in foreign language, area studies, and world affairs; (3) produce new knowledge about other nations and cultures, particularly those of the non-Western world; and (4) develop curricula and instructional materials in foreign languages, area studies, and world affairs needed by education, government, and business.

Programs funded under the Fulbright-Hays Act Section 102 (b) (6) provide first-hand experience in the area of specialization, update and extend research knowledge, and maintain and improve language skills. Program assistance includes fellowships for faculty and doctoral dissertation research, group projects for research and training, and curriculum consultant services of foreign experts to improve foreign languages, area studies, world affairs, and intercultural education in U.S. schools and colleges.

Program Effectiveness:

Data on program effectiveness are limited at this time to those on program reach found in the files of the Office of Education. In FY 1971, 107 Ph.D candidates in non-Western studies received fellowships for dissertation research abroad in 51 countries on a variety of topics. Examples include the effects of multi-lingual adult education on national identity in Nigeria, assimilation of nationalities in China with reference to Manchuria, and the politics of urban service in Chile. All of the doctoral fellows are preparing for teaching careers in U.S. colleges and universities.

In addition, funding for three inter-university centers for language training in Tokyo, Taipei, and Cairo provided 63 American students with intensive training on the advanced level.

Twelve curriculum consultant grants provided U.S. schools, State departments of education, and small four-year colleges with opportunities to develop curricula and teaching materials in international studies with the assistance of educational specialists from 10 countries.

In fiscal year 1972, this program will support 151 doctoral dissertation research fellowships, 7 group projects, and 20 curriculum consultant grants.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

A comprehensive evaluation is under way of the Group Projects Abroad and Foreign Curriculum Consultants programs supported under this legislation and Public Law 83-480, Section 104 (b) (2) and (3). Results of this evaluation were available by mid 1972.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program files.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Community Service and Continuing Education Program

Legislation:

Higher Education Act of 1965. Title I; Public Law 89-329; 20 U.S.C. 1001 as amended by Public Law 90-575; 20 U.S.C. 1001, 1005, 1006.

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1972

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$ 25,000,000	$ 10,000,000
1967	50,000,000	10,000,000
1968	50,000,000	10,000,000
1969	10,000,000	9,500,000
1970	50,000,000	9,500,000
1971	60,000,000	9,500,000
1972	60,000,000	9,500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of the program is to assist in solving community problems such as housing, poverty, recreation, employment, transportation and health thereby improving the quality of life in American communities by encouraging and assisting colleges and universities to stress community service as a major function and to plan, develop, and carry out innovative and cooperative community service and continuing education programs which will assist people to solve community problems.

The program provides grants to the States on 66 2/3 percent Federal and 33 1/3 percent non-Federal matching basis. The Commissioner of Education approves a basic state plan and an annual program amendment. A state agency approves all project proposals from colleges and universities, and allots available resources to conduct approved projects.

OE strategy is to fund fewer, larger, and more comprehensive projects that may remain permanent features of institutions after the period of Title I funding and to fund those which will provide appropriate higher education contributions to selected national priorities of environmental and ecological education, drug abuse education, assistance to the Model Cities programs, and the improvement of state and local government services. In addition to traditional types of programs such as specifically designed seminars, conferences, and continuing education courses, the development and demonstration of new mechanisms such as community centers, consortia, urban agents, the urban observatory, action research, and student-faculty forces are being tried.

Program Effectiveness:

Data on program effectiveness are limited to those published in the Fifth Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education. It is extremely difficult to measure or even estimate the degree to which CSCE programs have actually upgrade the quality of life by contributing to the solution of community problems. However, an estimate of the number of persons who actually receive direct educational, counselling, or consultative assistance may be made. During FY 1971 state agencies activated 539 projects involving 559 institutions of higher education and approximately one million participants. In addition, five times as many were probably reached indirectly through the mass media. According to the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, of the 501 separate institutions participating in FY 1970, 34% were four-year private institutions; 27% were four-year public institutions; 18% were land grant and state universities; 19% were two-year public institutions; and 2% were two-year private institutions. During FY 1970, 47% of the projects were conducted in urban areas; 10% in urban-suburban areas; 10% in rural areas; and the remainder were classed as comprehensive covering larger regions, including some on a state-wide basis. The Advisory Council suggests that Title I is the Federal government's "most appropriate, if not its only tool, for advocating, and triggering" reforms within Higher education aimed at enabling and encouraging its faculty and students to respond effectively to the community's need for problem-solving assistance.

The most recent Advisory Council report contains the following recommendations:

1. An expanded and strengthened Title I program should become the focal point for coordinating and better utilizing state and Federal resources for post-secondary continuing education for adults.

2. In administering the Title I program, the U.S. Office of Education should continue to work directly with the states.

3. The program should be fully funded at $60,000,000.

4. The Act should be amended to provide, when appropriations are above the 1971 level, that the Commissioner of Education shall have available to him up to ten percent of the sum appropriated annually for grants to individual institutions or consortia for national and regional demonstration projects.

5. Title I of the Higher Education Act should be extended for five additional years.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Sixth Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education will contain an evaluation study conducted by the Council staff.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

U. S. Congress. The House of Representatives. House Document No. 92-163. Fifth Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education. March 1971.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Land-Grant Colleges and Universities Program

Legislation:

Second Morrill Act of 1890, as amended; 26 Stat. 417; 7 U.S.C. 322, 323; Bankhead-Jones Act, as amended; 49 Stat. 439; Public Law 182; 7 U.S.C. 329.

Expiration Date:

None

Funding History:

Year	Authorization *	Appropriation
1961	$ 5,052,000	$ 5,052,000
1962	10,744,000	10,744,000
1963	14,500,000	14,500,000
1964	14,500,000	14,500,000
1965	14,500,000	14,500,000
1966	14,500,000	14,500,000
1967	14,500,000	14,500,000
1968	14,500,000	14,500,000
1969	14,720,000	14,550,000
1970	14,922,000	14,720,000
1971	14,620,000	12,680,000
1972	14,620,000	12,600,000

*The Second Morrill Act, as amended, provides a permanent annual appropriation which gives an annual grant of $50,000 to each state, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. This amount ($2,600,000) is included in the authorization levels shown here. Land-grant institutions have received Federal aid since 1862; however, for the purposes of this report, the earliest year shown is 1961.

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the program is to make higher education more accessible to all and thereby to contribute to the nation's trained manpower by providing annual grants to 70 land-grant colleges and universities in 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico to support instruction in agriculture, mechanic arts, English, mathematics, science, economics, and specialized teacher training in agriculture, mechanic arts, and home economics.

Each state (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) receives $50,000 under the Second Morrill Act. Each of these jurisdictions receives $150,000 from Bankhead-Jones funds plus an additional allotment based upon population. Grants are paid to State Treasurers. State legislatures must provide by statute for the division of funds if the state has more than one land-grant institution. No portion of the funds may be applied to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of buildings or to the purchase of land. An annual report on the expenditure of the funds must be made by each institution to the U. S. Office of Education. In line with the OE strategy of directing institutional assistance toward developing institutions, future funds available under these programs will be targeted on predominantly black land-grant colleges.

Program Effectiveness:

Although no formal evaluation has ever been made of these programs, it is evident that the purposes of the Acts have been largely fulfilled. Land-grant colleges and universities educate about a fifth of the currently-enrolled college students and grant 40 percent of the doctoral degrees.

In Fiscal Year 1971, 69 institutions received grants under the program. About 94 percent of the funds were used for salaries of instructors and the remainder for instructional equipment. In Fiscal Year 1972, 70 institutions divided an appropriation $80,000 under that of 1971.

Land-grant colleges and universities in Fiscal Year 1970 shared in approximately $178 million in regular Federal appropriations (funds for research experiment stations and for cooperative extension--both administered by the Department of Agriculture--as well as Morrill/Bankhead-Jones funds). The land-grant colleges and universities program represents about 6% of the total. The largest single grant from this program in Fiscal Year 1970 was about $600,000 to Cornell University; the smallest was $16,000 to MIT. These funds do not make up a significant portion of any institution's budget, but the impact is greatest on the smallest ones, i.e., predominantly black land-grant colleges and universities in the South. Grants in Fiscal Year 1970 to these types of institutions ranged from $128,000 to South Carolina State College to about $19,000 for Lincoln University in Missouri. These black institutions tend not to receive large grants from the programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, 1862-1962, by Henry S. Brunner. U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1962.

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

NDEA Fellowship Programs

Legislation:

National Defense Education Act of 1958;
Public Law 85-864; as amended; 20 U.S.C. 462.

Expiration Date:

June, 1973

Funding History:

	New Fellowships Authorized	New	Fellowships Supported Continuing	Total	Appropriat
1959	1,000	1,000	-	1,000	$ 5,300,000
1969	1,500	1,500	1,000	2,500	12,650,000
1961	1,500	1,500	2,500	4,000	20,690,000
1962	1,500	1,500	3,000	4,500	22,262,000
1963	1,500	1,500	3,000	4,500	21,200,000
1964	1,500	1,500	3,000	4,500	21,200,000
1965	3,000	3,000	3,000	6,000	32,740,000
1966	6,000	6,000	4,500	10,500	55,961,000
1967	7,500	6,000	9,000	15,000	81,957,000
1968	7,500	3,328	12,000	15,328	86,600,000
1969	7,500	2,905	9,328	12,233	70,000,000
1970	7,500	2,370	6,233 (a)	8,603	48,813,000
1971	7,500	2.100	6,245 (b)	8,345	47,285,500
1972	7,500	0	4,650 (c)	4,650	26,910,000

1/ $177,000 of FY 1965 appropriations were transferred to Teacher Cancellations, NDEA II.

2/ $137,000 of FY 1966 appropriations were transferred to Teacher Cancellations, NDEA II.

3/ $1,115,000 of FY 1967 appropriations were transferred to Teacher Cancellations NDEA II.

4/ $325,000 of FY 1968 appropriations were transferred to teacher cancellations, NDEA II.

(a) Includes 170 special fellowships for veterans.

(b) Includes 770 special fellowships for veterans and 200 fourth year fellowships.

(c) Includes 180 special fellowships for veterans.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Increase the supply of well-trained college teachers and encourage the development of doctoral level education on a broad geographic basis by providing 3-year fellowship support for graduate students.

This program aids graduate schools in strengthening their doctoral programs, in developing interdisciplinary programs tailored to prepare teachers in fields of emerging manpower needs, and in helping veterans, formerly on fellowships , resume their education in order to prepare for academic careers.

Each NDEA IV fellowship is a three-year award providing a stipend of $2400 for the first year of study, $2600 for the second, $2800 for the third, and $500 per year for each dependent. In addition, a $2500 per year educational allowance is provided to the institution for each NDEA fellow actively enrolled.

Panels of academic consultants review institutional applications and make initial recommendations to an Advisory Committee which, in turn, recommends institutional allocations to the Commissioner for approval.

Funds budgeted for the College Teacher Fellowship Program (NDEA Title IV) FY 1972 and 1973 will support only continuing fellows; they provide no money for new fellowships. The Program is currently under review to determine what its role should be in the future. This review has been made necessary because there no longer appears to be a shortage of college teachers with the doctorate in a number of academic disciplines. Changes in the objectives of theprogram are under consideration to make it more helpful in supporting students in those areas in which there is currently, or soon will be, an unmet need for highly trained personnel.

In 1973, operating under existing legislation, we expect to provide additional support for Doctor of Arts programs to prepare teachers for Lower Division instruction in two and four-year colleges. Institutions will be urged to intensify their efforts to recruit doctoral candidates from disadvantaged minority groups.

Program Effectiveness:

Among the accomplishments of this program during 1971-72 are:

1. An estimated 2,225 students who had been on NDEA IV fellowships were awarded the Ph.D. degree at the end of the 1970-71 academic year.

2. Participating universities, at the urging of the Division of University Programs, have expanded and improved training in college teaching for NDEA fellows as well as their other doctoral students.

3. The number of approved programs in environmental and ecological studies was increased from 124 to 140.

4. Doctor of Arts programs were supported for the first time.

In addition to the general statements of accomplishment cited above, the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. has recently made its report on the second and final phase of the study of the NDEA IV Fellowship Program. A brief summary of the report follows.

The BSSR Study of the NDEA IV Program

In 1967, the Office of Education initiated a two part study to assess the extent to which Title IV of the National Defense Education Act had met its basic objective of increasing the number of college and university teachers by assisting doctoral students preparing for academic careers. Three specific questions are addressed in the study:

1. What are the characteristics of NDEA Title IV Fellows and how do they compare with those of other doctoral candidates and recipients?

2. How effective are NDEA Fellowships in facilitating completion of the doctorate and in reducing the amount of time required?

3. How effective is the program in increasing the supply of college and university teachers?

Phase I of the study, completed in 1968, was primarily descriptive and focused on Question I with some analysis on the types of grantees most likely to complete the tenure of their fellowship. Phase II of the study, completed in 1970, was concerned primarily with Questions 2 and 3.

Phase I

Phase I of the study compiled basic data on the characteristics of NDEA Title IV fellows and how they compared with the total population of doctoral recipients. In addition, the study attempted to indicate the extent to which the award of fellowships to institutions of higher education encouraged the development and full utilization of the capacity of graduate programs in the U.S. leading to the doctorate and promoted wide geographic distribution of doctoral programs.

The study covered the first four years of the Title IV Program, from the academic year 1959-60 through 1962-63. A total of 5,500 fellowships were awarded during this period, 1,000 in the Fall of 1959 aand 1,500 in each of the three succeeding years. Later years were excluded because grantees for subsequent years would be extremely unlikely to have completed the doctorate by June 1966, which was the latest date for which data on doctoral recipients were available.

While the BSSR study contains detailed discussions and analyses of their findings in Phase I, only a brief summarization of some of those findings will be presented here.

Phase I Findings

An analysis of thelocation of institutions receiving grants for the support of graduate fellowships programs indicated that the Program was successful in creating a wide geographic distribution of graduate programs. In 1959-60, 123 institutions were supported growing to 161 in 1962-63. Institutions, particularly in the Southeast, where doctoral programs were the weakest, showed the greatest growth. Furthermore, during this same period, all NDEA IV awards were made to new or expanding graduate programs.

Some of the basic characteristics about the population of NDEA fellows are:

NDEA fellows throughout the four year period of the study were most likely (+50%) to be pursuing doctoral degrees in the Social Sciences and the Humanities, followed by the physical sciences; one out of every four NDEA fellows resigned before completing his fellowships, most in the first year and because of a change in career plans or for other personal reasons; three out of ten of the Fellows had completed the doctorate within four years; grantees in education were most likely to complete the degree and those in the Humanities and Social Sciences were least likely to have earned degrees; over half of the NDEA Fellows who received the doctorate reported teaching (or teaching and research) as their primary post doctoral activity.

Phase II

Phase II of the study was concerned with substantiating further the findings in Phase I, and providing additional data on the effectiveness of the fellowship program in 1) facilitating completion of the doctorate and in reducing the amount of time required, and in 2) increasing the supply of college and university teachers. Phase II findings are based on roughly a 70% response to the questionnaire mailed to students who were awarded NDEA fellowships in 1960-61 and in 1961-62.

Phase II Findings

Individual characteristics reported in Phase I were substantiated. Additional data indicated that when the socio-economic backgrounds of NDEA fellows and comparison groups were compared, the socio-economic backgrounds of NDEA fellows were lower than those of the comparison group students. Further, the data showed that the majority of NDEA recipients (80%) reported having an undergraudate grade letter average of B+ or better as against only 58% of the comparison group.

Data collected on doctoral completion rates indicates that the NDEA program has been successful in reducing the time required to complete the degree and in increasing completions of the degree. NDEA fellows' average duration of doctoral study was substantially shorter (2½ years) than the national average and somewhat less (by 2 years) than that of the comparison group. Further, the attrition rates for NDEA fellows were lower than among graduate students in general.

The study's analysis of employment status indicated that the fellowship program was successful in meeting its objective of increasing the number of qualified college or university teachers. Two-thirds of the NDEA fellows in the sample were holding academic positions at the time of the survey, and had made plans to continue their academic careers in the future. Completion of the doctorate was an important determinant in academic employment: 3/4ths of the men and 4/5ths of the women holding doctorates were employed in a college or university; however, even those without the doctorate had contributed to the objectives of the fellowship program in that nearly half were employed in colleges or universities.

Two reasons for the success of the NDEA Title IV Graduate Fellowship Program might be inferred from these data. First, graduate institutions participating in the program were successful in identifying graduate students committed to academic careers. As this study confirmed, clarity of vocational goals at the beginning of doctoral study contributes greatly to successful completion. The NDEA fellowship which requires selection of a college teaching career for eligibility was probably helpful in encouraging students to clarify their goals.

Secondly, by making it possible for Fellows to work full-time on general coursework, and especially on the dissertation, the NDEA fellowship was successful in reducing the amount of time required to complete the doctorate.

The data in Table I show that 73.7 percent of the women, and 66.4 percent of the men, awardees of the first five years were employed by colleges and universities. The only other employers which attracted more than 10 percent of this group of doctorates were Industry and Business which employed 12.3 percent of the men.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program files.

Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. Study of NDEA Title IV Fellowship Program, Phases I and II. 1968, 1970.

TABLE I

Postdoctoral Employers of the First Five Classes (1959-60 - 1963-64) of Title IV Fellows by Sex

Postdoctoral Employer	Total	Men		Women	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total, All Categories	3263*	3080	100.1	179	99.9
College or University	2180	2045	66.4	132	73.7
Elementary or Secondary Schools	26	23	0.7	3	1.7
U. S. Government	145	141	4.8	4	2.2
Foreign Government	93	87	2.8	5	2.8
State or Local Government	39	37	1.2	2	1.1
Non-Profit Organizations	85	81	2.6	4	2.2
Industry or Business	384	379	12.3	5	2.8
Self-employed	1	1	0.03	-	-
National Laboratories	17	17	0.6	-	-
Other**	293	269	8.7	24	13.4

*Omitted from the table but included in the totals are those fellows classified as sex unknown.

* *Other includes those fellows in military service, housewives, and non-respondents.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

EPDA, Part E Fellowships

Legislation:

Education Professions Development Act; Part E, Section 541, Public Law 90-35; 20 U.S.C. 461-465.

Expiration Date:

June 1972

Funding History:

Year	Total Authorization	Institutes Appropriation	Fellowships Appropriation
1969	$21,500,000	$4,700,000	$2,200,000
1970	36,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
1971	36,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
1972	Indefinite	5,000,000	5,044,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to increase the supply of well-prepared teachers, administrators, and specialists in areas of critical need for junior-community colleges and 4-year colleges and universities by providing one-and two-year fellowships for graduate level study in non-degree or advanced degree programs (other than the Ph.D. or equivalent for those planning a career in college teaching). Support is provided to: (1) programs that have a high promise for improvement over past practices in their training of higher education personnel; (2) programs that prepare personnel for the higher education needs of students from low-income families; (3) programs that train and retrain teachers, administrators, or educational specialists for junior colleges and 2-year community colleges located in urban areas; (4) programs that prepare personnel in higher education who will serve in developing institutions; (5) programs that prepare administrators, including trustees, presidents, deans, department chairmen, development officers, and financial aid officers; (6) programs that provide graduate level education for women training for careers in higher education; (7) programs that are a basic combination of the above priorities and which show evidence of effective communication between faculty, students, administration, and, where appropriate, local communities in the planning and implementation of the proposed program.

Institutions of higher education apply directly to the Office of Education for fellowships. Applications are reviewed by panels of faculty members and administrators who represent American higher education. Their recommendations are made to the Commissioner of Education.

Fellowship support is provided for one or two years depending on the length of the training program. Financial assistance is distributed in the following manner: $2,400 paid to students for first fellowship year and $2,600 for the second year; fellows are entitled to $500 during the fellowship year for each eligible dependent; the institution receives $2,500 a year for each fellow to pay for his tuition and required non-refundable fees.

In an effort to provide more flexibility in the recruitment of higher education personnel, the following strategies will be implemented on a pilot basis: (1) direct award of fellowships to two-year colleges; (2) award of fellowships to women for part-time study as recommended by the Newman Report; and (3) award of fellowships to programs which begin with the last undergraduate year.

Program Effectiveness:

Since the first group of EPDA V-E 2-year fellows have only recently completed the program and become available for employment (August 1971), no long-range measure of the program's effectiveness is available at this time. In the interim, some indication of the program's reach and effectiveness can be obtained from program funding data and a study of recent graduates respectively.

Program Funding Data

		Fiscal Year			
Output Measures		1969	1970	1970	1972
Number of Institutions Participating		50	74	82	89
Number of Approved Programs		51	78	93	101
	Total	415	960	903	921*
Number of Fellowships Awarded	(New)	(415)	(640)	470	586
	(Cont.)	(0)	(320)	433	335
Number of Fellowhsips Awarded in the Training of Personnel As:					
	Total	415	960	903	921
Teachers		(324)	(702)	651	660
Education Specialist		(68)	(183)	167	135
Administrators		(23)	(75)	85	126
Number of Fellowships Awarded to Train Personnel to Serve In:					
Total		(415)	960	903	921
Junior Colleges		(289)	(710)	689	731
Other Institutions		(126)	(250)	214	190

Average Yearly Amount of Fellowships	$5301	$5208	$5537	$5507

*Estimates for FY 72 are being revised therefore figures in this column are not consistent.

It seems clear from the table that program priorities indicated above are being met both in terms of types of institutions and subject areas.

A study of 253 Part E fellows who have completed their training programs at 22 colleges and universities reveals that 62 percent have accepted jobs in institutions of higher education, many in leadership positions. Of those not now currently employed in higher education, 19 percent are employed in elementary or secondary education, 10 percent are continuing their education, 4 percent had resigned from the program, 2 percent were in military service, and 3 percent had not yet accepted a job or had good job prospects at the time the reporting was requested.

In another sample, information volunteered from eleven institutions of higher education, which have approved programs designed to prepare personnel to work with the disadvantaged, shows that approximately 76 percent of the total or 86 fellowships were awarded to members of minority groups--Blacks, Spanish-speaking Americans, American Indians, and Orientals. In addition, just under 50 percent of the total 113 fellowships reported were awarded to women.

In yet another area, approximately 13 percent of the total 903 1971-72 Part E fellowships were awarded to military veterans.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluations:

Abt Associates, Cambridge, Massachusetts, is conducting an evaluation study which is due in August, 1972.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program files.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

EPDA, Part E Institutes

Legislation:

Education Professions Development Act of 1967 as amended. Part E. Section 541 through 543; Public Law 90-35 and Public Law 90-575; 20 U.S.C. 1119b.

Expiration Date:

June, 1972

Funding History:	Year	Total Authorization	Institutes Appropriation	Fellowships Appropriation
	1969	$ 21,500,000	$ 4,700,000	$ 2,200,000
	1970	36,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
	1971	36,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
	1972	Indefinite	5,000,000	5,044,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to train teachers, administrators, or educational specialists for higher education by providing support for institutes and short-term training programs. Emphasis is given three areas: (1) in-service training of personnel from junior and community colleges; (2) in-service training of personnel from developing institutions such as the predominantly black colleges and the small isolated four-year colleges; and (3) the training of higher education personnel to meet the needs of the increasing numbers of minority and low-income students seeking a college education. Since the Part E program began in FY 1969, most of the funds allocated under the EPDA Part E institute program have been focused on these areas of critical need.

In order to have maximum impact on the three priority areas, some emphasis is given to training administrators of junior colleges and developing institutions in modern management techniques.

This program provides support for in-service or pre-service training, part-time or full-time training programs of up to 12 months duration; training of college personnel in a variety of fields, including academic subject-matter areas; instructional methods and equipment, administrative skills, student personnel services, etc. Grants to the training institution cover all direct operating costs of the training program, participant support plus indirect costs.

Training must be of graduate-level quality; seminars, conferences, symposia, and workshops are not eligible for support unless part of a continuing training program; funds may not be used for purchase of equipment or for travel expenses of trainees.

Program Effectiveness:

No clear indication of program effectiveness is available at this time. A formal evaluation of this program is now underway.

In FY 1971, $5,000,000 was awarded to institutions of higher education in support of 94 institutes and short-term training programs in 47 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. These programs are providing training for approximately 6,800 higher education personnel.

In FY 1971 most of the funds were awarded to three priority areas as follows: (1) $2,493,961 (49.9%) supported programs to train junior college personnel; (2) $3,545,257 (70.9%) supported programs to train higher education personnel to serve minority and low-income students; and (3) $2,259,847 (45.2%) supported programs to train personnel of developing institutions. These allocations to priority areas are not mutually exclusive.

The data in the attached table indicate increasing emphasis on programs for junior college personnel, disadvantaged students, and developing institutions while the trend in programs for the other (primarily for teachers in non-developing 4-year colleges and universities) categories is clearly in the direction of de-emphasis. While these data do not provide the basis for assessing the long-term impact of this program, they do indicate that the EPDA Part V-E Institutes Program has focused on the national priorities the program was designed to address.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Abt Associates, Cambridge, Massachusetts, is conducting an evaluation study which is due in August, 1972.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program Files.

Funds Allocated for Support of Institute, Short-Term Training Programs, and Special Projects under Part E, Education Professions Development Act Fiscal Years 1969, 1970, and 1971

	Fiscal Year 1969	Fiscal Year 1970	Fiscal Year 1971
SUMMARY OF FUNDING			
Total funds allocated	$ 4,700,000	$ 5,000,000	$ 5,000,000
No. of programs supported	78	93	94
No. of persons trained	4,610 (est.)	5,312 (est.)	6,800 (est.)
Average grant	60,256	53,763	53,191
BREAKDOWN BY CATEGORIES*			
Junior college personnel			
No. of programs	24	47	51
Funds allocated	1,811,681	2,644.031	2,493,961
Percent of total allocation	38.5%	52.9%	49.9%
Disadvanted students			
No. of programs	26	50	58
Funds allocated	1,856.757	3,186,178	3,545,257
Percent of total allocation	39.5%	63.7%	70.9%
Developing institutions			
No. of programs	22	32	40
Funds allocated	1,515,227	1,702,715	2,259,847
Percent of total allocation	32%	34%	45.2%
Student Personnel Services			
No. of programs	14	15	11
Funds allocated	1,128,863	1,191,246	689,374
Percent of total allocation	24%	23.8%	13.3%
Educational media			
No. of programs	14	7	6
Funds allocated	977,574	290,177	257,919
Percent of total allocation	21%	5.8%	5.2%
Other (primarily for teachers in non-developing 4-year colleges and Universities)			
No. of programs	25	16	5
Funds allocated	1,115,532	848,097	187,842
Percent of total allocation	23.7%	17%	3.8%

---

*These categories are not mutually exclusive.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS AND EFFECTIVENESS INFORMATION

E. EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

Page

1. Attracting Qualified Persons to the Field of Education. 201
2. Teacher Corps Program. 203
3. State Grants Program for Attracting and Qualifying Teachers. . .206
4. Educational Leadership Program. 208
5. Career Opportunities Program. 210
6. Early Childhood Program. .214
7. School Personnel Utilization Program. 216
8. Special Education Program. 219
9. Training of Teacher Trainers Program. 222
10. Pupil Personnel Services Program. 224
11. Urban/Rural School Development Program. 226
12. Teacher Development for Desegregating Schools Program 228
13. Vocational Education Personnel Program 231

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Attracting Qualified Persons to the Field of Education

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
Part A, Sec. 504 of P.L. 90-35 Education Professions Development Act	FY 1972

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1969	$2,500,000	$ -0-
	1970	5,000,000	425,000
	1971	5,000,000	500,000
	1972	-0-	300,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the EPDA, Section 504(a) is to attract qualified persons to the field of education who ordinarily would not consider this field by:

1. identifying capable youth in secondary schools who may be interested in careers in education and encouraging them to pursue post-secondary education in preparation for such careers;
2. publicizing available opportunities for careers in the field of education;
3. encouraging qualified persons to enter or reenter the field of education; and
4. encouraging artists, craftsmen, artisans, scientists, homemakers, and persons from other professions and vocations, to undertake teaching or related assignments on a part-time basis or for temporary periods.

Since passage of the legislation underlying this program, a situation of a national teacher surplus in 1965, has emerged and been recognized. It is equally clear, however, that there are still certain areas in which there is either a shortage of teachers or a lack of highly qualified, highly motivated personnel. These areas include (1) personnel for inner-city or areas having a high concentration of educationally disadvantaged pupils, (2) personnel for bilingual or bicultural education, (3) personnel for vocational or career education and for education of the handicapped.

This program has been redirected to focus on these areas of critical shortages during fiscal year 1972.

Program Effectiveness:

There has been no comprehensive evaluation of the impact of this program on the recruitment of individuals into the teaching process. Data relating to program progress is limited to the history and experience of the four projects currently in operation.

At the National College of Education in Evanston, Illinois summer workshops to interest high school students in educational careers have been held for the past two summers. These workshops served 289 students.

The National Center for Information on Careers in Education provides information on education careers to a variety of persons and organizations. Now operating two-years, the Center is attempting to provide more information to persons from inner-city areas as one of its primary objectives.

At Washington Technical Institute, attempts are being made to develop and strengthen the role of volunteers as part-time educational personnel through the development and reporduction of materials that can be used in the training of educational volunteers or professionals using volunteer assistance (Project VOICE). Such volunteer assistance does not contribute to the teacher surplus, but does free teachers from many routine, non-professional duties so that they have more time to devote to actual instruction of their pupils.

In Menlo Park, California, the Portola Institute is operating a Kids Teaching Kids project which utilizes Mexican-American and low-income high school students as trained paraprofessionals and tutors. Approximately 260 minority high school students have been helped to become aides in elementary schools.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No evaluation studies currently underway. No new studies are planned since this program is to become part of the larger educational renewal strategy in the near future.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

None

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Teacher Corps Program

Legislation:

Title V, P.L. 89-329(1965) amended by Part B-1, P.L. 90-35
Education Professions Development Act

Expiration Date:

FY 1972

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$ 36,100,000	$ 9,500,000
1967	64,715,000	11,324,000
1968	33,000,000	13,500,000
1969	46,000,000	20,900,000
1970	80,000,000	21,737,000
1971	100,000,000	30,800,000
1972	Legislation pending	37,435,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the Teacher Corps is (1) to strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in areas having high concentrations of low-income families, and (2) to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their programs of teacher preparation. To achieve this, the Teacher Corps attracts and trains college graduates and upperclassmen to serve in teams under experienced teachers; attracts volunteers to serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants; and attracts and trains educational personnel to provide specialized training for juvenile delinquents, youth offenders, and adult criminal offenders. Typical participant activities involve academic work in a college or university on the job training in schools and participation in school related community projects. Typical program elements include flexible models of teacher education based on performance criteria, involvement with other college and university departments outside the school of education, granting credit for the internship period, and utilization of regular school staff and members of the community in the teaching staff.

Program Effectiveness:

Although no comprehensive evaluations of the impact of this program on increased learning achievements of disadvantaged students (a basic program goal) has yet been conducted, program statistics do suggest progress being made on accomplishment of intermediate objectives. For instance, in FY 1971, Teacher Corps directly affected the learning experiences of 94,720 children of whom 35,600 (37.6%) were from families with annual incomes below $3,000. Approximately 60 percent of the children were in elementary schools. The data also indicates the considerable impact of the program on schools and school systems (121 school districts involved), colleges and universities (67 institutions involved), special clientele groups, such as bilingual children, (23 programs), Indian children (5 programs), children in training institutions (4 programs), etc. as well as the impact of the volunteer teacher corps (13 projects) a special program which encourages high school and college students, parents and other community residents to serve as tutors or instructional assistants for children in disadvantaged areas.

An Office of Education survey of Teacher Corps graduates who completed programs in June, 1971 indicates that 80.5 percent of the interns remained in teaching: 74.1 percent are working with children from low-income families and of these, 47.3 percent are working in the school system where they were trained.

An assessment of the effectiveness Teacher Corps was completed August 31, 1970. The study was designed to determine the extent to which the program was achieving its stated goals and to identify program characteristics that contribute to success or failure. The basic data were gathered through visits to 10 of 70 Teacher Corps sites. The ten programs visited were third cycle (1968-70) and fourth cycle (1969-71) programs. On-site interviews were held with Teacher Corps program directors, school coordinators, principals, team leaders, cooperating teachers, interns, and community representatives.

The study indicated that Teacher Corp's strongest points are found in goals related to performing a service to low-income schools and to recruiting people for teaching of disadvantaged students. Teacher Corps has provided extra teachers to overcrowded classrooms in low-income area schools, in order to provide more individualized instruction to the children in these schools and a host of non-instructional services to these children and their parents. The people recruited by Teacher Corps are of the highest calibre: energetic, sympathetic and emotionally committed to helping disadvantaged children. It has successfully recruited interns from the ranks of minorities, the poor, males, and non-education majors for future professions in education.

Teacher Corps has made some changes in universities and the way they train teachers. Coordination between school districts and neighboring universities has been increased. Joint effort was demonstrated by the two in planning the program as well as implementing it.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Two formal evaluation studies were initiated in June, 1971, to conduct two kinds of evaluation--impact and process--to enable the program managers to make proper resource decisions and improve its management. The process evaluation will provide information concerning actual project operations and compare the findings with the intended operations so that project changes may be identified and communicated to the field. The impact evaluation will assess how the program affects participants, students and institutions of higher education and will identify those programs that are most effective. Data from the first study will be available in early 1972. Data from the second will be available in summer 1972.

A major new study of the programs is currently being planned for FY 1972 funding. The study will focus on assessing and analyzing the impact of the program as measured by three major dimensions--institutional change, enhanced teaching skills and behaviors, and improved classroom learning by students taught by Teacher Corps interns and graduates. This will be the first comprehensive study to concentrate attention and evaluation on measurement of program performance in terms of the ultimate student performance goal.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Operational data collected by the Teacher Corps Program. Data are collected annually.

2. In-house telephone survey of Teacher Corps graduates who completed programs in June 1971.

3. An Assessment of Teacher Corps by Resource Management Corporation, August 31, 1970.

4. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, June 14, 1971 by Resource Management Corporation.

5. Impact Evaluation of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development Programs, June 14, 1971 by Abt Associates, Inc.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

State Grants Program for Attracting and Qualifying Teachers

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P.L. 90-35, Section 4, amended by P.L. 90-575, Title I, 1968 Part B, Subpart 2 of the Education Professions Development Act	FY 1972

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1969	$50,000,000	$15,000,000
	1970	65,000,000	15,513,000
	1971	65,000,000	15,000,000
	1972	65,000,000	7,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the Part B-2 State Grant Program is to enable States to meet teacher shortages by recruiting and training persons outside the formal education system (from other professions, artisans and craftsmen, former teachers and others) as teachers or aides. Those recruited receive intensive short-term training. All who complete the training are assured a position in a school system where they receive additional on-the-job training. The B-2 program helps link a variety of Office of Education and State personnel development programs, and brings together State Education Agencies, colleges and universities, local education agencies, and communities on a cooperative basis to work out new kinds of teacher training programs.

The State Grants Program provides grants to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. To date, all 50 States and all Territories with the exception of the Canal Zone have approved State plans. Each State agency identifies its own priorities for training and within the framework of the Federal guideline establishes its own criteria for recruitment and standards for training programs. Training projects may be conducted directly by State education agencies or by local school districts who submit proposals for the State allocated funds, singly or in consortia.

The amount of funds allocated to each State is determined by a statutory formula which provides a minimum of $100,000 to each State and the equitable distribution of the remainder of the Congressional appropriation on the basis of the total public and nonpublic elementary and secondary school enrollments. No more than one-third of each State grant may go to support the training of aides.

Because the current teacher surplus has eliminated the need to encourage additional persons to enter the profession, the B-2 Program is being formally terminated on June 30, 1972. The program activity and experience gained with constituencies such as State Departments of Education, institutions of higher education and local education agencies in coordinating a number of Office of Education funded programs, however, will be merged with the anticipated establishment of local sites for carrying out the new educational renewal strategy.

Program Effectiveness:

No comprehensive evaluation of the impact of this program has been undertaken. Current program statistics, however, indicate the reach and contribution of the program.

Data obtained by the Office of Education from 45 States showed that 360 projects received FY 1971 funds with a total of 16,468 participants--5,334 teachers and 11,134 teacher aides. Of the 360 projects funded:

92 are training personnel in Early Childhood Education
90 are training personnel in Special Education
24 are training personnel for Vocational Education
33 are training personnel for Bilingual Education
121 are training personnel for Reading

Of the 360 projects, 193 or 54 percent, trained personnel to work in schools having a high percentage of students from low income families. Further, the majority of the trainees live in the communities in which these schools are located.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No formal evaluation studies are currently underway. No new studies are planned since the program will soon terminate.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Annual program operations data

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Leadership Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531 Education Professions Development Act	FY 1972

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	$90,000,000 (all of Part D)	$2,739,000
	1971	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	3,900,000
	1972	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	3,900,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

The Educational Leadership Program supports projects to increase the competence of people who now serve or intend to serve as administrators in elementary or secondary school systems at the local or State level. The primary objectives of the program are:

1. To identify and recruit personnel, especially from new and varied manpower sources, and train them for school administrative positions in inner-city schools and other difficult and challenging settings;
2. To create new or improve existing training programs for administrators which:
   a. reflect cooperative arrangements between local education agencies, instructions of higher education, and other agencies;
   b. are directed toward new roles for administrators; and
   c. influence change in the regular educational administration program within the university.
3. To train trainers of administrators and other leadership personnel.

Grants are made to local education agencies, institutions of higher education, and State education agencies.

Individuals who are now administrators or who wish to become administrators in elementary and secondary schools are eligible to participate. An attempt is made to attract promising young people from both educational and noneducational backgrounds. Emphasis is given to recruiting minority participants.

Highest priority is given to projects which seek to improve the quality of education in inner-city schools. The group to be served in this setting is largely comprised of minority groups and other disadvantaged peoples.

Program Effectiveness:

No comprehensive evaluation of the impact of this program on increased skills and competencies of educational leaders has been conducted. Program statistics, however, indicate program out reach and coverage.

In 1971, for example, the Educational Leadership Program funded 28 projects providing pre-service training to 265 persons and in-service training to an additional 869 persons for a total of 1,134. Over 40 percent of the pre-service participants represented minority groups and most participants were training for positions in inner-city schools.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Two formal evaluation contracts were let by the Office of Education in June, 1971, to conduct two kinds of evaluation--impact and process--to enable program managers to make proper resource decisions and improve its management. The Educational Leadership Program is included in both of these evaluations. The process evaluation will provide information concerning actual project operations and compare the findings with the intended operations so that project changes may be identified and communicated to the field. The impact evaluation will assess how the program affects participants, students and institutions of higher education and will identify those programs that are most effective.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Operational data collected by the Educational Leadership Program. These data are collected annually
2. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, June 14, 1971 by Resource Management Corporation.
3. Impact Evaluation of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development Programs, June 14, 1971 by Abt Associates, Inc.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Career Opportunities Program

Legislation:

P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531
Education Professions Development Act

Expiration Date:

FY 1972

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1970	$90,000,000 (all of Part D)	$22,217,000
1971	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	25,630,000
1972	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	27,230,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

The purpose of the Career Opportunities Program is to improve the education of children from low-income families by:

1. Attracting low-income persons--especially Vietnam veterans-- to new careers in schools serving people from low-income families;

2. Finding better ways of utilizing school staffs for services;

3. Developing training programs for school aide personnel leading to full certification as teachers which combine college level work-study and structured career advancement opportunities;

4. Encouraging greater understanding and participation between the community and the education system; and

5. Increasing cooperative relationships between related programs, agencies, and institutions.

Awards are made to local education agencies, which design training programs jointly with community organizations and agencies, community colleges, and nearby universities, and with their State education agencies. The schools subcontract with cooperating institutions of higher education to provide training services. Projects must be located in schools with high concentrations of low-income families.

The Career Opportunities Program encourages low-income men and women to start their careers as education auxiliaries at whatever level their abilities and interest permit, then follow a career lattice to more responsible, more remunerative, and more challenging jobs in low-income area schools.

Career Opportunities help school districts and universities create programs that are more relevant to the needs of low-income people and to the career training needs of the participants themselves. Training combines academic study toward high school equivalency, the associate of arts and the baccalaureate degrees, with classroom work in low-income area schools supervised by experienced teachers, who serve as team leaders and cooperating teachers. A combination of courses approach, including practicum, will enable participants to earn 30 credits per calendar year.

The Career Opportunities Program, (COP) is in 132 different project sites. It has 7167 participants who are working in 1,090 schools affecting approximately 250,845 children from low income areas. Two hundred and ten colleges and junior colleges are involved with COP efforts.

Program Effectiveness:

No comprehensive evaluation study measuring program impact on the ultimate objective of improved learning gains for low-income children has yet been undertaken. Program statistics, however, do point out the progress being achieved in terms of the intermediate objectives listed. National statistics indicate that:

1. Eighty-four percent of the participants are from areas designated as low-income;
2. Ninety-six percent of the participants are residents in the community where they are teaching;
3. One hundred and thirty-two school systems coupled with two hundred and ten institutions of higher education in 7,090 schools have accepted and are employing the auxiliary teacher in the classroom as an additional method to improving the education of children;
4. Eighty-three percent of the participants are members of a minority group;
5. Eight-hundred veterans are teaching in classrooms;
6. Through the advisory council (56% minority representation) the parents, community organizations, teachers, businessmen, university personnel work on a parity relationship to assess needs that are unique to their locale and are employing the COP process as a means for implementing the needed changes; and

7. Five thousand, two hundred ninety-eight participants have been employed in COP from approximately 251 other Federal, State, local, and private educational concerns.

In addition a few individual, local projects have undertaken detailed analyses of project operations and results. This has provided useful information for project refinement and improvement.

For instance, the Career Opportunities Project of the Richmond, California Unified School District conducted an evaluation of academic training received by the trainees involved in the program as of January 1971. The major purpose was to determine the overall level of academic success achieved by trainees as correlated with other students at the same college site who were not in C.O.P. This was done for the Fall and Spring Semesters at Contra Costa college during the academic school year 1970-71.

The conclusions reached by the study were: (1) COP trainees outperformed the control groups individually and on a combined control group basis; (2) success was demonstrated in the academic area because of a combination of COP objectives, total support within the program (counseling, fellow trainee support, tutoring where necessary etc.) and the individual trainee's own level of commitment; (3) the Contra Costa COP is a model for city, county, State, or Federal institutions to use if they want to provide an opportunity for low-income students to pursue a career that requires a higher educational degree; and (4) low-income people can participate at the college level successfully.

The Division of Research, Memphis City Schools, Memphis, Tennessee completed an evaluation of its COP for 1970-71.

It was found that the main reasons for withdrawals from COP were prompted by home obligations, lack of adequate transportation, conflict with work and reluctance to be a full-time student. Those aides failing to pass the School College Ability Tests (SCAT) attended a summer remedial program. Upon completion of this program fifty percent of the aides then passed the SCAT qualifying for college admission.

Some of the areas where teachers thought aides were most valuable included: helping small groups, observing students, checking workbooks, listening to students, helping students on individual projects, supervising on individual projects, supervising students outside class, commenting on student achievement and assisting with out-of-school trips. The services performed by aides on which the teachers placed the least value were performing certain clerical duties, working with parents and in the general category of student referral.

On the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, significant gains in achievement had been made during the year on the subtests of work knowledge, language, social studies, math computation and math concepts. Achievement gains in reading, math problem solving and science were not significant.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Two formal evaluation contracts were let by the Office of Education, June, 1971 to conduct two kinds of evaluation--impact and process to enable the Bureau of Education Professions Development to make proper resource decisions and improve its management. The Career Opportunities Program is included in both of these evaluations. The process evaluation will provide information concerning actual project operations and compare the findings with the intended operations so that project changes may be identified and communicated to the field. The impact evaluation will assess how the program affects participants, students and institutions of higher education and will identify those programs that are most effective.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Program operational and fiscal data collected by COP
2. COP Project, Richmond, California Unified School District
3. Project COP, Division of Research, Memphis City Schools, Memphis, Tennessee.
4. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Education Personnel Development, June 14, 1971 by Resource Management Corporation
5. Impact Evaluation of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development Programs, June 14, 1971 by Abt Associates, Inc.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Early Childhood Program

Legislation:

P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531
Education Professions Development Act

Expiration Date:

FY 1972

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	$90,000,000 (all of Part D)	$4,778,000
	1971	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	5,900,000
	1972	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	5,900,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

The Early Childhood Program supports projects to train and retrain personnel for programs for young children ages 3-9. The primary objectives of the program are to increase the supply of qualified teacher trainers, supervisors, curriculum and evaluation specialists, teachers and aides in early childhood education and to improve the quality of training programs for these personnel. Grants are provided to institutions of higher education and local education for institute or fellowship or combined programs.

Program Effectiveness:

In fiscal year 1971, the Early Childhood Program funded 48 projects serving 3,542 educational personnel of whom 379 were teacher aides, 2,029 were teachers, and 1,134 were teacher trainers and trainers of teacher trainers combined.

No comprehensive formal evaluations have been completed of the entire program. However, some of the Early Childhood projects have engaged in their own evaluation studies. For example, evaluation on projects TECT and KEK in the North Texas area indicated that the primary project objectives were achieved. Also an evaluation of a project in Metropolitan Denver indicated that significant progress was made in establishing coordination and cooperation among people concerned with training in the area but little progress was made in developing a career ladder for Early Childhood Personnel.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Two formal evaluation studies were begun in June, 1971 to provide two kinds of evaluation--impact and process--which will enable the program managers to make proper resource decisions and improve its management. The process evaluation will provide information concerning actual project operations and compare the findings with the intended operations so that project changes may be identified and communicated to the field. The impact evaluation will assess how the program affects participants, students and institutions of higher education and will identify those programs that are most effective. Data from the first studies will be available in early 1972. Data from the second will be available in summer, 1972.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Operational data collected by the Early Childhood Program. Data are collected annually.

2. The Plus in Education--An Evaluation of Project TECT and KET

3. Summative Evaluation--A program to provide for coordination of training of workers in early childhood education

4. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, June 14, 1971

5. Impact Evaluation of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development Programs, June 14, 1971

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

School Personnel Utilization Program

Legislation:

P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531
Education Professions Development Act

Expiration Date:

FY 1972

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1970	$90,000,000 (all of Part D)	$4,039,000
1971	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	3,000,000
1972	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	3,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The goal of the School Personnel Utilization Program is to encourage adoption of differentiated staffing patterns in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. The following objectives relate to attainment of this overall goal:

1. To train educational personnel for new and differentiated staffing patterns which include the following elements:
    a. differentiated functions of all school personnel including teachers, administrators, and para-professionals;
    b. differentiated salaries according to functions and roles;
    c. flexible instructional time schedules;
    d. differentiated instructional modes.
2. To improve the managerial, organizational, instructional and technological skills and attitudes of professional personnel by operationally defining the skills relative to the particular staffing pattern and training for them.
3. To bring about changes in student attitude and changes in achievement in those specific instructional areas for which differentiated staffing patterns are to be employed.

4. To increase the understanding, support, and participation of the community in the educational system.

5. To increase understanding, support, and participation in other schools within the system.

6. To encourage state education agencies to consider alternatives for utilizing certified and non-certified personnel and to encourage flexible credentialing practicies.

7. To promote participation of local teacher organizations in major decisions.

8. To encourage universities to make changes in in-service and pre-service programs.

Grants are made to institutions of higher education and State and local education agencies.

In 1971, the SPU program had 20 projects involving 5,415 participants.

Program Effectiveness:

No information is currently available concerning the impact of differentiated school staffing on the staff of the school units, the students in the participant schools or the school communities involved.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

During FY 71, the Evaluation Training Center at Florida State University: (1) developed a graduate training program in the evaluation of SPU programs; (2) analyzed and revised SPU Program objectives; (3) developed instruments and procedures and the subsequent training of project evaluators required to assess the impact of the SPU Program; (4) developed a comprehensive model for evaluating SPU Programs; and (5) performed extensive field testing of the evaluation model on a selected sample of projects. The report on the evaluation of SPU projects is expected in FY 1972.

Other evaluation efforts started in FY 71 will provide more program operational and impact information during FY 1972. Two evaluation contracts were let by the Office of Education June, 1971 to conduct two kinds of evaluation--impact and process to enable the Bureau of Education Profession's Development to make proper resource decisions and improve its management. The School Personnel Utilization Program is included in both of these evaluations. The process evaluation will provide information concerning the operations of the various SPU projects and compare the findings with the intended operations so that project changes may be identified and communicated to the field. The impact evaluation will assess how the program affects participants, students, institutions of higher education and State Departments of Education and will identify those programs that are most effective.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual program operations data
2. An Evaluation of School Personnel Utilization Projects by the Evaluation Training Centers at Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida
3. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, June 14, 1971 by Resource Management Corporation
4. Impact Evaluation of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development Programs, June 14, 1971 by Abt Associate, Inc.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Special Education Program

Legislation:

P.L. 90-35, 1967, Parts C, D, and F
Education Professions Development Act

Expiration Date:

FY 1972

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1970	$90,000,000 (all of Part D)	$6,992,000
1971	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	6,900,000
1972	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	6,900,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the Special Education Program is to train regular classroom teachers and other educational personnel to meet the needs of handicapped children in regular classrooms. Primary objectives are:

1. To increase the number of regular educational personnel who understand and can deal effectively with handicapped children in regular classrooms, particularly leadership personnel such as deans of education, school superintendents, principals, and State education agency administrators who are capable of significantly influencing other personnel or programs;
2. To train teacher trainers so that they can integrate special education effectively into regular teacher preparation programs;
3. To encourage training institutions to modify existing preparation programs so that regular teachers and other educational personnel will be more capable of working with handicapped children in the regular classrooms;
4. To provide training in the techniques of special education for personnel such as school administrators, school psychologists, counselors, educational media specialists who are or will be responsible for educating the handicapped in the regular classroom, and teacher aides for both regular and special education classrooms; and

5. To encourage the development of training projects that address the needs of handicapped children in poverty populations, both urban and rural.

Grants are made to institutions of higher education and State and local education agencies.

Program Effectiveness:

While no comprehensive evaluation of the impact of this program on enhanced learning for handicapped children has been undertaken, program statistics indicate progress being made on primary objectives. For instance, in 1971, 43 projects, addressed to children from minority groups and/or children from poverty situations, were funded by the Special Education Program. Training was provided for approximately 5,800 educational personnel 4,200 of whom were classroom teachers. The remainder of 1,600 were comprised of administrators, trainers of teachers and teacher aides. Approximately 50 percent of the participants were non-Whites representing Blacks, Chicanos, and American Indians.

The University of Minnesota Leadership Training Institute conducted a review of ongoing projects in 1970-71 to assess the degree to which project operations were meeting project objectives. The study indicated a high degree of program reliability in terms of meeting objectives.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Two formal evaluation contracts were let by the Office of Education in June, 1971, to conduct two kinds of evaluation--impact and process--to make proper resource decisions and improve management. The Special Education Program is included in both of these evaluations. The process evaluation will provide information concerning actual project operations and compare the findings with the intended operations so that project changes may be identified and communicated to the field. The impact evaluation will assess how the program affects participants, students, and institutions of higher education and will identify those programs that are most effective.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual program operations data
2. The BEPD Program in Special Education: A Second Year Evaluation -- Projects, Leadership, Training Institute and Bureau, Institute for Educational Development, June 10, 1971
3. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, June 14, 1971 by Resource Management Corporation

4. Impact Evaluation of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development Programs, June 14, 1971 by Abt Associates, Inc.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORTS ON EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Training of Teacher Trainers Program

Legislation:

P.L. 90-35, Part D, Section 531
Education Professions Development Act

Expiration Date:

FY 1972

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$102,750,000	$62,647,000
1967	226,250,000	70,250,000
1968	354,750,000	75,250,000
1969	300,000,000	80,000,000
1970	340,000,000	13,280,000
1971	340,000,000	12,200,000
1972	pending	12,200,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Trainers of Teacher Trainers Program (TTT) supports training projects for teacher trainers and trainers of teacher trainers in institutions of higher education and in local and state education agencies. The primary objectives of the program are to identify, recruit, and train qualified persons to be teacher trainers and trainers of teacher trainers to increase the compentency of personnel now functioning in these positions and to improve the quality of preservice and inservice training for personnel in these positions.

Grants are made to local and state education agencies and institutions of higher education for combined short-term and long-term training activities.

Participants include university or school personnel responsible for the preparation or leadership of teacher trainers, as well as prospective trainers. Other school or college personnel who serve on clinical teams or whose training provides practicum experience for teacher trainers or trainers of teacher trainers also participate.

Program Effectiveness:

In FY 1971, 33 projects were funded involving directly and indirectly approximately 26,000 persons. Representation was from community, school staff, and prospective teachers. Lesser numbers of education faculty, other faculty, and school administrators were involved in the TTT activities. Public school students were indirectly involved through practicums in their classrooms.

Early in 1971 an evaluation of program operations was initiated to determine the extent to which project plans had been implemented, whether or not project personnel had been recruited and retrained, and to learn the characteristics of persons involved in the TTT program. The findings were mixed. Of 909 planned activities only 24 failed to be implemented. In recruitment and retainment areas data showed increases in trainers of teachers, and teachers, decreases in trainers of teacher trainers, and modest increases in community people and students involved in the projects. Examination of personnel characteristics data showed substantial representation of minority groups.

Later in 1971 an assessment of the impact of the program was begun, especially in terms of its goals and objectives. The results of the effort revealed: (1) satisfactory results in trainers in areas of curriculum design, supervision, evaluation, learning theory, child development, community relations, and instructional methods; (2) satisfactory results in clinical experiences and training in problem solving; (3) conflicting results in perceived changes in the climate of institutions; (4) unsatisfactory results in changes in entrance requirements, hiring practices, school/university relations; and (5) positive results in involvement of parity groups.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Two formal evaluation studies were initiated in June, 1971 to conduct two kinds of evaluation--impact and process--which will enable program managers to make proper resource decisions and improve its management. The process evaluation will provide information concerning actual project operations and compare the findings with the intended operations so that project changes may be identified and communicated to the field. The impact evaluation will assess how the program affects participants, students and institutions of higher education and will identify those programs that are most effective. Data will be available from the first study early in 1972. Data will be available (from the second) in summer 1972.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. TTT Program Evaluation for the TTT Clusters
2. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, June 14, 1971
3. Impact Evaluation of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development Programs, June 14, 1971

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Pupil Personnel Services Program

Legislation:

P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531
Education Professions Development Act

Expiration Date:

FY 1972

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	$90,000,000 (all of Part D)	$3,859,000
	1971	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	4,900,000
	1972	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	4,900,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

The goal of the program is to improve the quality of education for low-achieving students from families of low-income by providing entry and practicing pupil personnel service workers with interdisciplinary training coupled with practicum experience.

The specific objectives are:

1. To improve qualifications of trainers and supervisors of pupil personnel specialists;
2. To develop alternative manpower development models;
3. To recruit and train minority group members as pupil personnel specialists; and
4. To bring about organizational change in both the training institutions and in schools where pupil personnel specialists function.

Projects include training in the following fields:

1. Guidance services, including counseling;
2. Psychological services, including school psychology, psychiatric, and other mental health services;
3. Social services, including school social work, attendance work, and visiting teacher services; and

4. Health services, including the teacher (or school) nurse, physician, and dental hygienist.

Projects may be short (usually no less than 6 weeks total) or long (as much as two summers and the intervening academic year). Although summer training projects are usually full time, any project may call for either full- or part-time participation or a combination of these.

In 1971, grants were made to 16 institutions of higher education to provide training for trainers of pupil personnel workers as well as prospective and experienced pupil personnel specialists at the pre-school and elementary levels. A total of 2,241 such personnel participated in these programs.

Program Effectiveness:

No evaluation of the impact and effectiveness of this program has been completed to date. Such a study is currently underway, however, (see next section).

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Two formal evaluation contracts were let by the Office of Education in June, 1971, to conduct two kinds of evaluation--impact and process-- to enable program managers to make proper resource decisions and improve management. The process evaluation will provide information concerning actual project operations and compare the findings with the intended operations so that project changes may be identified and communicated to the field. The impact evaluation will assess how the program affects participants, students and institutions of higher education and will identify those programs that are most effective.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual program operations data

2 Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, June 14, 1971 by Resource Management Corporation

3. Impact Evaluation of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development Programs, June 14, 1971 by Abt Associates, Inc.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORTS ON EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Urban/Rural School Development Program

Legislation:

P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531
Education Professions Development Act

Expiration Date:

FY 1972

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1971	$90,000,000 (all of Part D)	$9,300,000
1972	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	9,300,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

The Urban/Rural School Development Program is designed to bring about enriched learning opportunities for students in schools serving a high concentration of low-income families. Its basic purpose is to produce --(over the life of a five-year project)--accelerated classroom academic achievement, improved affective development, and increased range of opportunities for students. Through a strategy of close school-community collaboration, the program concentrates on the following intermediate objectives:

1. To make training for educational personnel more responsive to the needs of the school, its staff, its pupil population, and the community by means of concentrating training and program development resources in a single school or in a limited number of related schools;

2. To develop improved decision-making capabilities in school and community personnel;

3. To develop within the school and community a continuous process for identifying critical needs and assembling ideas, resources, and strategies to meet those needs; and

4. To effect a process through which the individual school and its community accepts responsibility for its decision, and is accountable for its actions regarding the utilization of resources, formulation of strategies and development of a program to improve pupil performance.

Local education agencies are the usual grantees.

Educational personnel normally employed in participating schools (teachers, paraprofessionals, counselors, principals, etc.) receive training, and implement curricular and organizational reforms.

Program Effectiveness:

Due to the recent start of this program (FY 1971), no evaluation data is yet available. Useful data is currently limited to initial program statistics. In May 1971, the program issued grants to 27 projects. In addition, there were 5 planning grants plus one grant to the Stanford Leadership and Training Institute. It is anticipated that the projects funded by this program will furnish training and retraining opportunities for approximately 3,790 persons (school staff, community persons directly associated with the program including council members).

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

In June, 1971, an evaluation contract was let by the Office of Education to provide information concerning actual Urban/Rural School Development project operations and compare the findings with the intended operations so that project changes may be identified and communicated to the field. The results of this study will be available in August, 1972.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual program operations data

2. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, June 14, 1971 by Resource Management Corporation

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Teacher Development for Desegregating Schools Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531 Education Professions Development Act	FY 1972

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	$90,000,000 (all of Part D)	$9,466,000
	1971	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	4,900,000
	1972	90,000,000 (all of Part D)	4,900,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the Teacher Development for Desegregating Schools Program is to meet the special needs of educational personnel who serve or will be serving in recently desegregated schools. The primary objectives of the program are the following:

1. To improve the subject matter and professional competence of inservice teachers especially in the South in order to bring better instruction and educational services to the children served. The most critical areas are language arts, reading and mathematics;

2. To prepare inservice teachers and other educational personnel to perform better as professionals in interethnic and cross-cultural school and community settings;

3. To enhance the capacity of the institutions supported to do a better job of preparing teachers, thereby reducing the need for inservice and remedial retraining.

Grants are made primarily to institutions of higher education.

Groups of teachers and other educational personnel from the same school or district are trained as a team at project centers. In a few instances, where the resources are available, regional training centers for teacher trainers are supported. Training is in one of the priority fields of language arts, mathematics, Black Studies and Human Relations, Educational planning, and relates to the particular problems which teachers must face in desegregating schools. When the teams return to their respective schools they are expected to extend their knowledge by conducting training sessions for other personnel in their school. In turn their own training is reinforced by part-time academic year followup.

Program Effectiveness:

No comprehensive evaluation of the impact of this program in terms of improving classroom learning has yet been undertaken. Program statistics provide an overview, however, of the progress being made toward intermediate program objectives. For example during the 1970-71 period:

> Twenty-seven institutes were held during the summer, 1970, which enrolled 1,107 participants or a mean of 41 per institute. There were 35 percent males and 65 percent females and 76 percent Blacks and 24 percent Whites. Among the participants, 45 percent taught in elementary school, 33 percent in secondary school, and 22 percent in pre-kindergarten, college, or adult teaching. The participants taught a total of 63,193 pupils. The summer institute staff was 294 or 13 per institution, the majority (91 percent) of whom were professionals. Racially, the staff included 63 percent Blacks and 37 percent Whites with men and women equally represented. Seventy-three percent of the staff members held professional rank and 44 percent held the doctoral degree. Approximately three-fourths of the staff had experience teaching in the public schools, while 90 percent had prior experience in higher education.
>
> During the academic year, there were 28 institutes enrolling 1,336 participants or a mean of 48 per institution. The sex, ethnic distribution, and educational level of the academic year participants were comparable to the summer institute group. The academic year enrollees taught a total of 58,737 pupils, the majority of whom were enrolled in junior and senior high schools. The project staffs were comparable to the summer staffs during this period, but generally were part-time with the institute during the academic year component.

An evaluation carried out by the Human Affairs Research Center looked at 30 TDDS projects during 1970-71. An overall assessment and a detailed analysis of all projects were undertaken through site visits and observations along with participant questionnaire data.

Employing a set of systematic criteria thirty percent of the projects were judged significantly effective, 50 percent were judged moderately effective, 17 percent were judged minimally effective, and three percent were not evaluated in terms of the extent to which they accomplished the goals and objectives of the program.

A total of 486 of the 1,107 summer participants responded to the questionnaire, representing a 48 percent return. The vast majority of these respondents (87%) indicated that all of the program objectives had been achieved to a moderate or great extent. The areas cited as those of greatest improvement included ability to provide better instruction for children, knowledge of new teaching methods and techniques, and knowledge of the subject matter.

The strengths and limitations of each project and the program as a whole were cited and discussed, together with recommendations for program improvement. Common strengths of the projects included quality instruction in the summer programs, good staff-participant relationships, on-going support provided for enrollees during the academic year component, a high level of understanding of the project objectives among staff members, and effective administration of the projects. Common project limitations included limited success by the participants in effecting change in their local school districts, emphasis of didactic instruction over experimental learning, lack of effective methods and procedures to prepare teachers to be effective in working through interpresonal problems that might result in working in desegregating schools, minimum formulation of behavior objectives to measure participant outcomes, lack of involving paraprofessionals in the training of teachers, not enough advanced planning for the academic year component, minimal involvement of key local school district personnel, and lack of involvement of the institution itself to the end that resources are increased so that the project becomes an integral part of the college or university.

At a meeting in Atlanta, Georgia (August, 1971) four executive Secretaries of State Teachers Associations (Reed, Alabama; Duckworth, Mississippi; Haynes, Louisiana; and Solomon, South Carolina) commended highly the effectiveness of the program with respect to the relief brought to teachers and administrators displaced or adversely affected by school desegregation.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No projected studies are currently planned for this area. There are no major studies underway.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual program operations data

2. An Evaluation of the 1970-71 Teacher Development for Desegregating Schools Program - The Human Affairs Research Center, New York, New York

January 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education Personnel Program

Legislation:

P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part F, Secs. 552 & 553
Education Professions Development Act

Expiration Date:

FY 1972

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1970	$35,000,000 (Part F)	$ 5,698,000
1971	40,000,000 "	6,900,000
1972	45,000,000	6,900,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The goal of the Vocational Education Personnel Program is to provide State and local career education leaders with the capability for developing a systems approach to professional personnel development which is responsive to local needs and which will effect improved preparation of education personnel at institutions of higher education. The enabling objectives are 1) to initiate cooperative arrangements between State and local education to ensure the adequate preparation and development of professional personnel for career and vocational education; 2) to improve the quality and effectiveness of the instruction and administration of existing career and vocational programs; and 3) to continue support for the revision and refinement of the States systems for professional personnel development in career and vocational education.

The Vocational Education Personnel Program provides opportunities for State boards for vocational education and institutions of higher education to train and retrain experienced vocational education personnel and other personnel in order to strengthen vocational education programs and the administration of schools offering these programs. This is accomplished through grants that are awarded to States according to the degree to which they have developed a statewide plan for professional personnel development in vocational education.

The Leadership Development Program, which grants awards to institutions of higher education for the development of new and innovative programs at the leadership level, has been the second component of the Vocational Education Personnel Program. The doctoral component of this program is currently being phased out.

Program Effectiveness:

There has not been a comprehensive evaluation of this program during its two years of operation. Program statistics, however, indicate the progress being made toward the intermediate and long-term objectives.

The following are direct results of Federal funding:

1. Each of the 50 States has now designed and implemented a comprehensive systems approach to the initial and continuing development of vocational education personnel.

2. Each State agency has established at the State-level a special unit with responsibility for determining professional personnel needs on a Statewide basis; for planning, coordinating, and funding programs to meet those needs; and for monitoring and maintaining a continuous assessment and evaluation of the State system for vocational education personnel development.

3. Approximately 90 training programs involving participants from all service areas have been supported with a resulting reduction of fragmentation in the field and a more comprehensive approach to teacher education and local program operation.

4. At least 47 States are now making special efforts to bring State and local education agencies and institutions of higher education together for a more coordinated and concerted effort in developing and expanding vocational education to meet the needs of each State.

5. Approximately 20 States have conducted in-service training in management by objectives for all of their State-staff plus some local administrative personnel.

6. Approximately 10 States are re-evaluating their certification requirements for vocational education personnel and are beginning to relate them to competency-based criteria.

7. Approximately 20 States are now involving the business-industry complex in the development of their career and vocational education personnel.

8. Special projects in approximately 10 States have trained educational personnel for implementing the career education concept at the local level.

9. Special projects have been supported in approximately 20 States to develop among vocational educators a better understanding of the needs and characteristics of both underprivileged and handicapped youth.

10. Eighteen universities are receiving assistance in implementing comprehensive leadership development programs at the doctoral level to supply high-level leadership personnel for career and vocational education. Currently, there are 216 Federally supported, and 44 State supported participants enrolled in doctoral programs of these universities.

11. Activities supported through the States during FY 71 and the approximate percentages of total funding for each category include: (1) in-service programs for increasing the competencies to teachers, administrators, and support personnel (45%); training in-service teachers to work with disadvantaged and handicapped youth (21%); exchange of education-industrial personnel (9%); developing teachers for career education (6%); and recruitment and training of teachers from other fields for vocational education (19%).

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Two formal evaluation contracts were let by the Office of Education June, 1971 to conduct two kinds of evaluations--impact and process to enable the Office of Education to make proper resource decisions and improve program management. The Vocational Educational Personnel program is included in both of these evaluations. The process evaluation will provide information concerning actual project operations and compare the findings with the intended operations so that project changes may be identified and communicated to the field. The impact evaluation will assess how the program affects participants, students and institutions of higher education and will identify those programs that are most effective.

Ohio State University is developing an evaluation system for vocational education leadership and development activities for all State programs. It is anticipated that the system will be flexible enough to adapt to the evaluation needs of each State. After completion of this developmental effort it is anticipated that training of State leadership will be conducted in the interests of implementing the model.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual program operations data.

2. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, June 14, 1971 by Resource Management Corporation.

3. Impact Evaluation of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development Programs, June, 1971 by Abt Associates, Inc.

4. An Evaluation System for Vocational Education Leadership and Professional Development Activities, Ohio State University, Dr. A. J. Miller.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS AND EFFECTIVENESS INFORMATION

F. LIBRARIES AND EDUCATION TECHNOLOGY

Page

1. Library Services 235
2. Public Library Construction. 239
3. Interlibrary Cooperative Services. 241
4. Academic Library Resources 243
5. Career Training - Libraries. 245
6. Educational Technology and Library Demonstrations. 247
7. Educational Broadcasting Facilities. 249
8. Sesame Street 251
9. Undergraduate Instructional Equipment 253
10. Media Specialist Program. 255
11. School Library Resources. 257

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Library Services

Legislation:

Library Services and Construction Act, Title I, as amended by P.L. 91-600 and Title IV-A and IV-B

Expiration Date:

1976

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
Beginning in 1972, State Institutionalized Services (Title IV-A) and Services to the Physically Handicapped (Title IV-B) were combined under Title I.	1965	$ 25,000,000	$ 25,000,000
	1966	25,000,000	25,000,000
	1967	35,000,000	35,000,000
	1968	45,000,000	35,000,000
	1969	55,000,000	35,000,000
	1970	65,000,000	29,750,000
	1971	75,000,000	35,000,000
	1972	112,000,000	46,568,500
(Old Title IV-A)			
	1967	$ 5,000,000	$ 350,000
	1968	7,500,000	2,120,000
	1969	10,000,000	2,094,000
	1970	12,500,000	2,094,000
	1971	15,000,000	2,094,000
	1972	See above	See above
(Old Title IV-B)			
	1967	$ 3,000,000	$ 250,000
	1968	4,000,000	1,320,000
	1969	5,000,000	1,334,000
	1970	6,000,000	1,334,000
	1971	7,000,000	1,334,000
	1972	See above	See above

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides support to States through basic and matching formula grants to assist them in providing library services to areas without such services or areas with inadequate services; to assist in improving quality of information services including services to specialized groups such as the disadvantaged, the physically handicapped, and those in public institutions; and to strengthen public library administration at the State level. The Federal share ranges from 33% to 66% except for the

Trust Territory which is 100% Federally funded, and States must match in proportion to their per capita income. States must maintain the same level of fiscal effort for handicapped and institutionalized library service that existed prior to the combination of these programs under the new amendments.

General data for the current program are as follows:

		1971 Actual
1.	Population with access to LSCA services (in thousand)	86,000
2.	Disadvantaged persons with access to LSCA services (in thousand)	18,500
3.	Number of State institutionalized persons served by LSCA	302,000
4.	Number of handicapped persons served by LSCA	70,000
5.	Number of books purchased (in thousand)	6,500
6.	Number of Right-to-Read projects supported by LSCA	65
7.	Number of Drug Abuse projects supported by LSCA	100
8.	Number of Environmental Education projects supported by LSCA	54

Beginning in 1972 with the implementation of the new legislation (P.L. 91-600), the public library will be encouraged to develop fresh concepts of community library services through leadership at the Federal level; expansion of the multi-media community learning centers now being demonstrated in selected cities; encouragement in initiation and expansion of special projects in Right-to-Read, career education, drug abuse education, environmental education and others; and the encouragement of utilization of paraprofessionals in public libraries.

Program Effectiveness:

The first study of the impact of Title I services, covering the period from 1964 to 1968, was made by the System Development Corporation. In reviewing the LSCA activities in 11 States it found that most projects felt handicapped by: lack of manpower; lack of coordination among public libraries and other educational agencies; need for research in determining whether "disadvantaged projects" were reaching their goals; lack of understanding on the part of the public of the library's potential and actual services; lack of ability of libraries to react quickly to public demands for more services; and lack of suitable measurements of library performances.

The Behavioral Science Corporation study identified, field visited, and evaluated **public library service to the disadvantaged in selected cities.** These projects were not limited, however, to Title I projects. This pilot study of 15 local library projects for the urban disadvantaged, utilizing user and non-user interviewers for evaluation, recommended that libraries find better ways to coordinate with schools when dealing with disadvantaged children. The successful programs were characterized by the inclusion of some or all of the following: active participation by the target group; emphasis on audio-visual rather than print materials; and the fact that the program had been viewed as a significant service by the adults in the community.

A study conducted by Barss, Reitzel identified a pool of over 200 public library reading and reading related programs. This pool was analyzed to determine 30 effective programs, which were then visited. The on site analysis determined impact by observation and questioning of staff and users. Those adjudged most effective in changing reading behavior and which were capable of being replicated at the lowest cost were designated as exemplary. The study was not limited to LSCA funded projects.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There is an ongoing major evaluation study to determine how the Library Service and Construction Act, Titles I & II is meeting the public library needs of special clientele groups, e.g. disadvantaged, ethnic minorities, handicapped, and institutionalized persons. The project will survey all State Library Agencies, all known ongoing projects directed toward these groups, and discontinued projects. Fify-five representative sites will be field visited and library and related agency personnel will be interviewed as well as library users and non-users. This study will provide an inventory of projects, a needs assessment, and recommendations for change. This project is expected to be completed by October 1972. The study should be complemented by the results of library Demonstration/ Research Projects which are designed to survey and analyze the library services to the Spanish Americans of the Southwest, the American Indian, the aging, and the urban poor.

A major public library evaluation is planned for this area. This study will assess the current total national public library situation by supplementing the 1972 Public Library Survey with detailed questionnaires and field visits to State Library Agencies, Public Library Systems, related agencies, users, and non-users. The project will focus on directions, strategies and funding patterns for the future.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Overview of LSCA Title I, by System Development Corporation. Published by Bowker.

2. A Study of Public Library Service to the Disadvantaged in Selected Cities, by Claire Lipsman and contracted to Behavioral Science Corporation.

3. Study of Exemplary Public Library Reading Related Programs for Children, Youth and Adults, by Barss, Reitzel.

4. Evaluation of LSCA Services to Special Target Groups, by System Development Corporation. To be completed October, 1972.

5. Various Library Demonstration Projects: These projects are designed to survey and analyze the public library and information services to the Spanish Americans of the Southwest, the American Indian, the aging, and the information needs of the urban poor.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Public Library Construction

Legislation:

Library Services and Construction Act,
Title II, as amended by P.L. 91-600

Expiration Date:

1976

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	$ 30,000,000	$ 30,000,000
1966	30,000,000	30,000,000
1967	40,000,000	40,000,000
1968	50,000,000	21,185,000
1969	60,000,000	9,185,000
1970	70,000,000	7,807,250
1971	80,000,000	7,092,500
1972	80,000,000	9,500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides funds to States on a matching basis to support the construction of public libraries. Funds may be used for the construction of new buildings, for additions to existing buildings and for renovation or alteration of existing buildings or for the acquisition of an existing facility to be used for public library purposes. Grants are made to States on a formula basis. The Federal share ranges from 33% to 66%, except for the Trust Territory which is 100% Federally funded and States must match in proportion to their per capita income. The long-range objective is to achieve total State and local support for public library construction without Federal funds.

Program Effectiveness:

The contribution to the national stock of library facilities that has been made by this program over the years is reflected in program statistics. From the program's inception in 1965 through 1972, 1,814 projects totaling $159,629,000 have been supported adding more than 20 million square feet of floor space. State and local agencies will have contributed approximately $399,000,000 in support of these projects. Over 3 million square feet of new or renovated public library floor space has or will be added in 1971-72.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation study being conducted by the System Development Corporation to examine public library service for special clientele groups will, among other things, review and analyze how Title II constuction funds have been used to purchase new facilities or to provide renovated facilities for projects aimed at special target groups.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Evaluation of Library Services and Construction Act Services to Specialized Target Groups, by System Development Corporation. To be completed October 1972.
2. Program Operational Data

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Interlibrary Cooperative Services

Legislation: Expiration Date:

Library Services and Construction Act, Title III, as amended by P.L. 91-600 FY 1976

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1967	$ 5,000,000	$ 375,000
1968	7,500,000	2,375,000
1969	10,000,000	2,281,000
1970	12,500,000	2,281,000
1971	15,000,000	2,281,000
1972	15,000,000	2,640,500

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides funds through formula grants to States to establish and maintain local, regional, State or interstate cooperative networks of libraries for the coordination of informational services of school, public, academic, and special libraries and information centers, permitting the user of any one type of library to draw on all libraries and information centers. No State matching is required.

Program Effectiveness:

In 1971, 104 cooperative projects were supported, an increase of nine over fiscal year 1970. Over 7,000 libraries were involved in these projects, an increase of approximately 1,000 over the previous year. Participation by all classes of libraries in telecommunications or information processing systems has increased. An example is the Nevada Center for Cooperative Library Service where technical processing for 12 public libraries, 2 school districts, 1 academic library, 1 hospital library, 1 correctional library and the State library is being done. It is estimated that the Center will process 35,000 to 40,000 volumes at a cost of $1.50 per volume. The Nevada effort and other similar ones result in a lower unit cost and a reduction of staff time for each book processed. State reports and staff visits indicate that the Program has produced similar results in other states. Such review indicates that the Program has been successful in establishing cooperative efforts among classes of libraries and in sharing of services and resources, leading to cost reductions and savings.

of the graduate fellowship program and for the training or retraining of 610 participants in 20 short- and long-term institutes.

A specialized evaluation focusing on the earlier fellowship program was conducted in FY 1969. It found that all 3 types of graduate support (the masters, post masters and Ph.D. programs) were accomplishing their intended goals. At the same time, the study indicated that the master's program was the most effective of the three for bringing in new personnel outside of the academic library field to the library profession. These findings were utilized but are now superseded by the phasing-down and termination of the fellowship program.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies.

No evaluation studies are currently underway in this area. No such studies are planned.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Overview of the Library Fellowship Program by the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. of Washington, D.C., FY 1969
2. Data Collection and Description of HEA Title II-B Institutes, by Rutgers University completed October 31, 1971

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Academic Library Resources

Legislation:

Higher Education Act of 1965, Title II-A

Expiration Date:

1971

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$ 50,000,000	$ 10,000,000
1967	50,000,000	25,000,000
1968	50,000,000	25,000,000
1969	25,000,000	25,000,000
1970	75,000,000	9,816,000
1971	90,000,000	9,900,000
1972	90,000,000	11,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides funds to institutions of higher education to assist and encourage them in the acquisition of library materials--books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials. Three types of grants are awarded to eligible institutions of higher education: (1) Basic grants up $5,000 which must be matched dollar for dollar; (2) Supplemental grants up to $10 per student with no matching required; and (3) Special purpose grants which must be matched with $1 institution for every $3 Federal money.

Beginning in 1971 the funds were redirected through revision of the guidelines to support developing and new institutions such as community colleges, vocational technical institutes, those institutions with high incidences of low-income students and those institutions sharing their resources with schools with more limited collections.

Program Effectiveness:

The 1971 redirection of the program to needy institutions resulted in the reduction of the number of grants from over 2,000 to 773. Three hundred and ninety of these grants were awarded to four year institutions of higher education with the greatest need. Seventy-six grants were made to Black Colleges and the remaining 307 were given to Technical Institutes and Junior Colleges. Reports from the field and staff visits suggest that this redirection has made a significant impact on improving library resources for these institutions. The following examples typify the diversity of programs supported.

Funds provided under this program in 1971 to the Miami-Dade College, North Campus, Miami, Florida accounted for 43% of that institution's expenditures for library materials as compared to 11% in 1970. The FY 1971 grant of $88,230 will enable the Junior College to add over 11,000 volumes to its collection. The program funding for Black colleges has increased significantly between 1970 and 1971. Both the Alabama Agriculture and Mechanics University, Normal, Alabama and the Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama received under $4,000 each in 1970 and approximately $30,000 in 1971. Seventy-five thousand dollars was awarded to the Cooperative College Library Center, which is a consortium of 18 Black colleges in 9 southern States. This allows for the sharing of a central core of research and enrichment materials to supplement the basic collections at each college. It further allows the use of a shared catalogue and lower prices through cooperative purchasing. The award to the Navajo Community College, Chinle, Arizona increased sixfold (to almost $19,000) between 1970 and 1971.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no ongoing evaluation studies directly related to this program. There are no evaluation studies planned for this area in the near future.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program Operational Data

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Career Training - Libraries

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Act of 1965, Title II-B	1971

Funding History:	Year	Authorization*	Appropriation
	1966	$ 15,000,000	$ 1,000,000
	1967	15,000,000	3,750,000
	1968	15,000,000	8,250,000
	1969	11,800,000	8,250,000
	1970	28,000,000	6,833,000
	1971	38,000,000	3,900,000
	1972	38,000,000	2,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides project grants to institutions of higher education to support training and retraining of librarians and information scientists, including paraprofessionals, for service in all types of libraries and information centers. In the past professional training was accomplished through institutes and post-graduate degree granting fellowships. Now this is to be accomplished through long- and short-term institutes only, phasing out the fellowship program after 1972 when all current fellowship grantees will have completed their studies.

Program Effectiveness:

No comprehensive evaluation of the impact of this program on library services has yet been undertaken. Program statistics, however, reflect the reach of this program in terms of training opportunities used to promote change through personnel development. Between 1966 and 1970 this program awarded 2,337 graduate fellowships and provided institute training funds for 6,532 participants. In 1971, this program was redirected to provide more responsive library services to disadvantaged and minority groups by retraining librarians and training members of minority and disadvantaged groups so that they might enter into the library profession as professionals and/or paraprofessionals. The primary focus of this redirection was to achieve change in the system for preparation and utilization of library manpower to be more responsive to the informational needs of the disadvantaged. Five institutes funded under this program provided training for 72 participants as paraprofessional trainees, and 55 professional librarians were retrained to work with paraprofessionals. Paraprofessional trainees were provided employment opportunities when training was completed. A total of 46 short- and long-term institutes involving 1,429 participants ultimately benefiting the disadvantaged were funded in fiscal year 1971. The fellowship program was limited to 124 continuing doctoral candidates. For FY 1971, the average cost per participant was about $10,000 for those in the fellowship program, and $2,688 for persons in long term institutes and, $585 for each participant in short term institutes. In 1972, funds were available for the training of 40 doctoral candidates in the final year of the graduate fellowship program and for the training or retraining of 610 participants in 20 short- and long-term institutes.

---

*Combined authorization with Library Research and Demonstration.

The only formal evaluation study of this program was conducted during FY 1969 by the Bureau of Social Science and was restricted to the fellowship program. It found at that time that all 3 types of graduate support (the masters, post masters and PhD. programs) were accomplishing their intended goals; however, the study indicated that the master's program was most effective out of the three studied for bringing in new personnel to library areas outside of the academic library field. These findings were utilized but consistent with the Office of Education focus on the disadvantaged, institute training seems more effective than fellowships.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Preliminary reports of the Rutgers study suggest mixed results of this program. The final report is expected shortly. There are no other evaluation studies planned for this area in the near future.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Overview of the Library Fellowship Program by the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. of Washington, D.C.
2. Data Collection and Description of HEA Title II-B Institutes, by Rutgers.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Technology and Library Demonstrations

Legislation:

Legislative authorization for Library Research--Higher Education Act of 1965, Title II-B

Expiration Date:

FY 1971

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1967	(See library training authorization)	$3,500,000
	1968		3,500,000
	1969		2,000,000
	1970		2,100,000
	1971		2,171,000
	1972		2,750,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides funds through grants and contracts with public and private institutions for demonstration projects relating to the improvement of library and information services and technology applications to education and instructional systems.

The program was redirected in 1971 to focus support on improving services to the disadvantaged. In 1971, 18 projects were funded including projects to identify and demonstrate improved methods of information service to the Aging, Spanish-speaking Americans, Indian communities, and residents of the inner-city. A prototype project, the community learning center, is underway in Philadelphia to service elementary and secondary school students and their parents in a large low-income, inner-city area. In addition, support was provided for initial demonstrations in applications of technology to education including such efforts as the Technological Applications Project, establishing the Center for Advanced Study of Technology in Education, Libraries, and Information Science and Various commissioned papers dealing with specific technology topics.

Program Effectiveness:

There has been no formal evaluation of this program; however, the nature and the diversity of projects funded has resulted in changes and improvement in the field of library and information science. Some significant examples of projects and their results are: a 1971 funded study of library service to the Spanish Americans of the Southwest has been responsible for the establishment of a new public library in Trinidad, Colorado (to be funded by OEO) and the planning for a Community Learning Center in Santa Fe, New Mexico; a project funded from FY 1967-71 designed and implemented the first fully-automated, on-line prototype university library at Stanford University, with the concept being extended to other area colleges; a FY 1971 funded project was responsible for the development of a computerized regional cataloguing system for college consortiums now in use by the Ohio College Library Learning Center (with 50 participating colleges) and a consortium of 20 colleges in Atlanta, Georgia with an estimated savings of $400,000 for the participants; other studies funded by this program directly resulted in the formation of the President's Commission on Libraries and served as the basis for the recommendations made by the education task force to the recent White House Conference on the Aged.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no ongoing evaluation studies directly related to this program. No such studies are planned for the near future.

Sources of Evaluation Studies:

None

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Broadcasting Facilities

Legislation:

Communications Act of 1934, as amended
Title III, Part IV

Expiration Date:

FY 1973

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	$32,000,000	$13,000,000
	1966	32,000,000	8,826,000
	1967	32,000,000	3,304,000
	1968	10,500,000	-0-
	1969	12,500,000	4,000,000
	1970	15,000,000	4,321,000
	1971	15,000,000	11,000,000
	1972	15,000,000	13,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Funds are provided for the purchase of electronic equipment for initial activation or expansion of noncommercial educational broadcasting facilities to serve educational, cultural, and informational needs in homes and schools. Up to 75 percent matching grants are made to eligible tax supported institutions (such as school districts, colleges and universities); State Educational Broadcasting Agencies; nonprofit foundations organized primarily to operate an educational broadcasting station; and municipalities which own or operate a facility used only for noncommercial educational broadcasting. No State may receive more than 8½ percent of the appropriation in any one year.

The major goal of this program to provide the equipment necessary for a national system of noncommercial educational and public broadcasting stations capable technically and programmatically of serving local, State, and national needs; and to make available to all citizens a quality noncommercial broadcast service comparable to commercial stations. At present, approximately 25% of the population is still without a useable noncommercial television signal. Many existing ETV stations require expansion and improvement of transmission facilities.

Program Effectiveness:

No comprehensive evaluation of the impact of this program on the viewing and listening audience has been conducted. Program statistics for the last year, however, demonstrate the continuing contribution and reach of the program. In 1971, 57 noncommercial Broadcasting facilities received grant support, an increase of 17 over the previous year. These included 12 new and 18 expanded noncommercial educational television stations and 27 new or expanded educational radio stations. With an increased appropriation, the statutory State maximum increased from $367,000 to $935,000 in 1971, permitting greater flexibility in facilities planning among the States. This provided more funds per station to meet the costs for more sophisticated equipment. As a result of these 57 projects, more than 68 million persons receive new or improved services at an approximate cost of 31¢ per person for TV and 4¢ per person for radio.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no ongoing evaluation studies directly related to this program. No such studies are planned for the near future.

Sources of Evaluation Studies:

Program operating data

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Sesame Street

Legislation:

Cooperative Research Act
P.L. 83-531, as amended

Expiration Date:

Open

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1971	Indefinite	$ 2,000,000
	1972	"	5,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Sesame Street is an educational television program targeted toward the preschool disadvantaged child. Activities will be expanded in 1972 to include the development and broadcast of a remedial reading series, The Electric Company, aimed at children seven to ten.

The Children's Television Workshop, creators and producers of Sesame Street, is an independent non-profit organization, supported by grants and contributions from Federal and private sources, with U.S. Office of Education the main Federal Contributor.

Approximately 8 million preschool children (3 to 6 year-olds) benefitted through this Children's Television Workshop production at a cost per viewer of $1.29 per year.

Program Effectiveness:

The first two years of operation have been subjected to careful and detailed evaluation. The evaluation results support conclusions of program success and effectiveness. An evaluation study of the first year of Sesame Street by the Educational Testing Service indicated that the program had been successful in improving learning skills, particularly for preschool children in low-income areas who had general access to the VHF channels. In addition, public reaction and reaction from educators have been enthusiastic in support of the program and its success in stimulating the learning abilities of preschool children. Sesame Street has gained universal acceptance and the program is now shown in over 50 other countries.

In terms of its own stated goals, Sesame Street was in general highly successful. The first ETS study shows the 3-to-5-year old youngsters from a variety of backgrounds acquired important simple and complex cognitive skills as a result of watching the program. Those who watched the most gained the most. The overall conclusion is that the potential of educational television as an effective medium for teaching certain skills to very young children has been demonstrated by Sesame Street. In its second year, evaluation by ETS found that Sesame Street again was successful in teaching certain basic facts and skills to 3, 4, and 5 year old viewers. At the same time, it was less successful in achieving new and more ambitious goals incorporated in the second-year programs. Children of different ages gained about equally by watching the program but different age groups gained more in some goal areas than in others. There appeared to be no differences in the gains of boys and girls

The initial research and planning for the Electric Company, a remedial reading program for 7 to 10-year olds, was completed in 1971. The new program went on the air in October. An estimated 10 million elementary school children will view this program which will be an expanded and improved effort with greater participation by the targeted groups, and more widespread use of the program in the schools.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Evaluation studies like those described above will be a part of both Sesame Street and the Electric Company continuing activities.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. "The first year of Sesame Street: An Evaluation," by Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, October, 1970.

2. A Summary of the Major Findings in "The Second Year of Sesame Street: A Continuing Evaluation," by Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, October, 1971.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Undergraduate Instructional Equipment

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
Higher Education Act of 1965, Title VI-A	FY 1971

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$35,000,000	$15,000,000
1967	50,000,000	14,500,000
1968	60,000,000	14,500,000
1969	13,000,000	14,500,000
1970	60,000,000	-0-
1971	60,000,000	7,000,000
1972	60,000,000	12,500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to improve the quality of undergraduate instruction in institutions of higher education by providing financial assistance on a matching basis for the acquisition of instructional equipment, materials and related minor remodeling. Funds are allocated to the States by a formula based on higher education enrollment and per capita income. State commissions rank applications submitted by the institutions and recommend the Federal share which, except in hardship cases, may not exceed 50 percent of the total project cost. Eligibility under the program has recently been extended to post-secondary vocational schools and community colleges.

The recent program statistics reflect this current program redirection. A total of 325 grants, for instance, out of 762 awarded in 1971 were made to such post-secondary institutions, as shown below:

	1971 Actual
Number of Projects	
-No. closed circuit TV	170
-No. other equipment	592
Type of Colleges Rec'd Grants	
-Jr./Voc. Educ./Tech. Inst.	325
-B.A. Degree	177
-Above B.A. Degree	260
-(Black Colleges)	(76)

Program Effectiveness:

A formal evaluation of this program has not been conducted. However, reports from States, the higher education community, and staff visits suggest that the program has been successful in improving undergraduate instructional programs. Usually these program funds are commingled with an institutions direct operating budget in order to provide continued acquisition of basic equipment and material.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no ongoing evaluation studies directly related to this program. Such studies are planned for the near future.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program operating data

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Media Specialist Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
EPDA, Part D, as amended	1971

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	Indefinite	$ 2,000,000
	1971	"	2,250,000
	1972	"	1,800,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides grants to institutions of higher education, State departments of education, and local education agencies, which are involved in the training of teachers, administrators, media specialists, policy makers, and other educational personnel in the utilization of media and educational technology for the improvement of learning in elementary, secondary, and post-secondary vocational schools.

Optimally, every teacher in the over 17,500 public school districts in the country should receive training in the use of educational media. In order to reach this audience for media specialty training, a strategy employing the "multiplier effect" has been utilized. This provides training for individuals who will subsequently engage in teacher training.

Program Effectiveness:

No comprehensive evaluation has yet been undertaken on the impact of this program on improved skills of educational personnel. Field reports suggest, however, that post-training behaviors lead to improved instruction. In addition, program statistics indicate program reach. For instance, in 1971 approximately 3,800 school district personnel benefitted through 76 Instructional Development Institutes (IDI), a 40-hour training package designed to provide teams of teachers, administrators, policy makers, and specialists with the skills needed for managing the multi-media learning environment. For example, an IDI was conducted in the Atlanta Public Schools in June, 1971 for fifty participants. This training program provided skills analyzing curriculum and instructional problems and developing solutions to these problems. At the conclusion of the institute, the participants were able to identify specific instructional problems within their own schools and develop their own plans for solving these problems. In addition, in 1971, 120 participants were trained in

10 long-term projects, and 500 participants were trained in 15 short-term institutes.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no ongoing evaluation studies directly related to this program; no such studies are planned for this area in the near future.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program Operational Data

January 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:
School Library Resources

Legislation:
Title II of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-10)

Expiration Date
June 1973

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	100,000,000	100,000,000
1967	128,750,000	102,000,000
1968	154,500,000	104,000,000
1969	167,375,000	50,000,000
1970	206,000,000	42,500,000
1971	206,000,000	80,000,000
1972	216,300,000	90,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of ESEA Title II is to provide school library resources, textbooks, periodicals, audio-visual materials, and other instructional materials for use in public and private elementary and secondary schools.

To apply for its allotment, each State or similar jurisdiction submits a plan for the operation of the Title II program to the U.S. Office of Education. The State plan must, among other requirements, provide for the distribution of materials on the basis of need, assure that materials will be provided on an equitable basis for the use of children and teachers in private schools, and assure that Federal funds will be used to supplement rather than supplant other programs serving the purpose of this title. No matching of Federal funds is required; however, current levels of State local and private schools expenditures for like purposes must be maintained. Local school districts apply for funds to the State Education Agency in accordance with procedures set forth in the approved State plan. On the basis of a comparative analysis and the application of standards, the State department determines from time to time the relative need of children and teachers for school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials available under Title II.

The Title II program consists of two components--acquisition of materials and administration. The acquisition program includes the purchase, lease-purchase, or straight lease of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials. It also includes the necessary costs of ordering, processing, and cataloging such materials and delivery of them to the initial place at which they are made available for use. Administration includes those executive, supervisory, and management responsibilities vested in the State agency and necessary to carry out State plans. Five percent of the total amount made available to the State under Title II, or $50,000, whichever is greater, is allowed for administration of the State Plan.

Program Effectiveness:

Information about this program comes primarily from two surveys of local education agencies: a survey carried out in FY 1968 which collected financial data as well as other descriptive data and a survey in FY 1970 (Consolidated Program Information Report) which focused upon financial and pupil participation data. There are no data, however, to show the effect of the program in terms of direct benefits to children. Among the more important findings of the surveys are that much of the money (64%) is used to acquire printed materials (other than textbooks), that most of the expenditures (78%) are focused on the general elementary and secondary population, that the number of program beneficiaries from non-public schools is proportional to the enrollment in non-public schools (about 10% of the total in each case) and that the program has stimulated State and local support for school library resources and other instructional materials.

The 1970 Consolidated Program Information Report provides the following estimates of children eligible and participating in Title II:

	Public School		Non-Public School	
Number of Children	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary
Eligible to Participate	20,265,554	13,094,743	1,927,534	742,211
Participating	10,608,467	11,725,118	1,759,774	686,909

The high participation rate in Title II by non-public school children is a feature of this program not common to most other Federal programs.

Though most of the Title II expenditures were for the general elementary and secondary population (78%), children from low income areas accounted for 21% of the total. With respect to specific use of Title II money, the FY 1970 survey found that 64% of the funds were used to acquire library books, periodicals, etc.; 30% for audio-visual materials and 6% for textbooks. All data from CPIR represents only the Title II effort directly concerned with LEA's, as the collection method does not reflect activities conducted by the State office.

Though there has been no real evaluation of the impact of Title II upon children, the surveys of 1968 suggested some consequences of the program. For example, in the three year period from 1964-65 to 1967-68 the proportion of schools with media centers increased from 52 to 85 percent. The variety and quality of materials in these centers as well as their use by students also increased. Survey respondents gave part of the credit for such improvements to the existence of Title II. The survey also provided evidence that Title II helped indirectly by stimulating State and local support for library resources and other instructional materials (but not textbooks).

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Collection of data on expenditures and pupil participation will be continued via the Consolidated Program Information Report. No formal evaluation of Title II is ongoing nor planned for the near future.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. USOE Program Statistics compiled by the US Office of Education
2. *The ESEA Title II Evaluative Survey: A Preliminary Report*. Washington, D.C. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, November 1970.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS AND EFFECTIVENESS INFORMATION

G. EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Page

1. Basic Research Program, Including Regional Research. 261
2. Applied Research and Development Program 264
3. Educational Laboratory and R&D Center Program. 267
4. Research Training Program 271
5. Experimental Schools Program. 274

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Basic Research Program, including Regional Research

Legislation:

Public Law 531, 83rd Congress as amended by Title IV, Public Law 89-10

Expiration Date:

Open

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	Indefinite	$ 18,283,000*
1966	"	30,500,000*
1967	"	23,485,000*
1968	"	24,865,000*
1969	"	24,397,000*
1970	"	22,562,000*
1971	"	11,959,000
1972	"	7,500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The goal of the Basic Research Program is to produce new and generalizable knowledge relevant to the educational process and new concepts and tools for the conduct and management of research. Research proposals are evaluated by three panels whose members are selected for their expertise in research methodology and their productivity in a substantive area. These panels focus on (1) Social psychology and personality, (2) Intelligence, learning, and cognitive functioning, and (3) The social sciences. The proposals are evaluated on criteria having to do with scientific rigor, potential for producing knowledge that is relevant to educational theory or practice, qualifications of the research personnel, and the economic efficiency of the proposed project. During FY 1971, 90 projects were supported under this Program.

The Regional Research component of the program provides grants for projects costing up to $10,000 in federal funds to be completed within 18 months. These proposals are submitted to the Regional offices where they also are evaluated by panels of experts. A total of 244 small-project grants were awarded during FY 1971.

The Basic Research Program will be transferred to the National Institute of Education if established.

---

*For the Fiscal Years 1965 through 1970 there was only a single line item to cover both Research and Development.

Program Effectiveness:

No major evaluation of the Basic Research Program has been undertaken. The results of specific projects, however, suggest the kind of contribution the Program can make to American education.

An example of the contribution of a major Basic Research project was the 5-year updating of the Project Talent data bank which provides longitudinal information on about 400,000 persons who were high school students in 1960. From this data bank researchers are able to investigate relationships between educational achievement and aptitude, extra-curricula activities and vocational interests, socio-economic background, school characteristics, and subsequent activities of students. Other significant projects dealt with background differences of youth in high school, at work, and unemployed: factors influencing career decision making; and a national survey of American Indian education. The Regional Research projects included some dealing with problems such as computer-assisted instruction for Spanish speaking teachers in mathematics, school readiness among disadvantaged children, and the year-round school program.

During the past few years there have been several reviews of the Research Program. Although not formal evaluations, they resulted in major decisions concerning the research program. One was to restore support for a multidisciplinary Basic Research Program to handle unsolicited proposals reflecting the concerns of researchers in the field. Another decision was to emphasize the "targeting" of research funds for the support of projects which focus on major educational problems identified by the Office.

A separate review of the Regional Research Program was undertaken with the assistance of the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University. The review confirmed that one of this Program's favorable characteristics was that it was considered to be closer to its clients than other R&D support programs. The review also highlighted the fact that the availability of support through the Program for doctoral dissertations was a major factor in producing talented educational researchers.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No evaluation studies are currently underway or planned for the near future. It is anticipated that if the National Institute of Education is established such programs will no longer be operated by the Office of Education.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Small-Project Grants of the Regional Research Program.
   Theresa F. Rogers, Lois W. Sanders, and Bernard Levenson.
   Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University.
   November, 1970.

2. Untitled Draft Report of a Study of Education Research and Development marked "Administrative Confidential."
Xeroxed document forwarded by Alice M. Rivlin, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, DHEW, to Joseph Froomkin, Assistant Commissioner for Program Planning and Evaluation, OE, on June 25, 1968.

   Prepared as response to letter from Director, Bureau of the Budget, to Secretary of HEW dated December 1, 1967 requesting review of the Department's activities in education research and development. Includes discussion of the decision-making process of the Bureau of Research, raises questions for further discussion, offers "substantive issues," etc.

3. Educational Research and Development in the U.S. Office of Education (Draft). (Frequently identified as the "Westheimer" Report or the PSAC Report) Task Group on Educational R&D of the President's Science Advisory Committee.
Frank H. Westheimer, Chairman of the Task Group, Dept. of Chemistry, Harvard University; John M. Mays, Staff Member for the Task Group, Office of Science and Technology.
President's Science Advisory Committee, Draft dated October 22, 1968. 37 pp. No cover.

   Summarizes the PSAC Task Group's understanding of the USOE Regional Laboratories, Research and Development Centers, and other projects--especially basic research. Group visited four laboratories and five centers. Makes recommendations to improve operations of OE's R&D program.

4. Research Subcommittee Report--July 15, 1969.
Michael O'Keefe Research Subcommittee Chairman
Typed Memorandum to Assistant Secretary/Commissioner of Education James E. Allen from Michael O'Keefe, undated.

   Memorandum contains key recommendations of the Research Subcommittee for consideration by the DHEW Education Task Force. Attached report discusses objectives, priorities, budget recommendations, and program descriptions.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Applied Research and Development Program

Legislation:

Public Law 531, 83rd Congress as amended by
Title IV, Public Law 89-10

Expiration Date:

Open

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	Indefinite	$ 18,283,000*
1966	"	30,500,000*
1967	"	23,485,000*
1968	"	24,865,000*
1969	"	24,397,000*
1970	"	22,562,000*
1971	"	3,041,000
1972	"	9,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the Applied Research and Development Program is to (1) produce through applied research conclusions for making major decisions about educational problems, and (2) produce tested alternatives to existing educational practice. Projects are directed toward such problems as resource allocation, accountability, and treatment of student alienation. Announcements are issued inviting proposals dealing with a specific problem. Only three or four target areas are handled at one time. Activities in this program are coordinated with development activities in the Educational Laboratories and R&D Centers and various OE operational support programs.

This Program will be transferred to the National Institute of Education if established.

Program Effectiveness:

No comprehensive evaluation of this Program has been undertaken to date. The Program has been kept under careful review internally. During the past few fiscal years, emphasis in applied research and development has moved from a relatively unstructured program based on unsolicited proposals to a more targeted or focused type of effort. The results of recent projects indicate the outcome of this program change as well as suggest the kinds of contributions the Program can make to American education. An example of providing relevant conclusions for educational decision-making (the first purpose noted above) is the process whereby a competency-based teacher training model developed under the Program has been used in a number of Teacher Corps projects to improve preparation of prospective teachers of the disadvantaged. The basic design of the models program has been included in the Teacher Corp guidelines and in other programs that provide support from the Education Professions Development Act.

---

*For the Fiscal Years 1965 through 1970 there was only a single line item to cover both Research and Development.

The second purpose, production of educational alternatives, is reflected in a variety of projects such as the following: (1) The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education designed and developed an information system and network facilities for better planning and management in colleges, universities, and higher education agencies; (2) The Florida State Junior High School Science Curriculum was developed and is now being used with 400,000 students; (3) The National Academy for School Executives which developed methods and materials for training more than 1,000 School Executives each year; (4) A review of R&D products coming from OE-supported efforts with identification of ten judged ready for intensive dissemination by the Office to get them into use in school systems throughout the country. These dissemination efforts are now in process.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation study nearing completion is examining successful R&D products which have become available to the schools during the past 5 years. Of the 117 products which were identified, 21 have been selected for intensive study in order to define the major steps in the developmental process from research to dissemination. These products also represent a variety of producers, making it possible to compare government-funded and private enterprise efforts. Information obtained to date suggest that -- from initial conceptualization through development, testing, refinement, staff training, and implementation -- successful R&D products may require up to 10 years in the process. Also, federal funds from several different agencies play an important role, even though the product itself is not directly associated with any one agency.

No new studies are planned in this area. It is anticipated that if the National Institute of Education is established, such programs will no longer be operated by the Office of Education.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Evaluation of the Impact of Educstional Research and Development Projects. American Institutes for Research. Calvin Wright and Jack Crawford
2. State-of-the-Art in Early Childhood Education: A Literature Survey. Central Midwestern Regional Education Laboratory. James Miller.

3. Selection of Products for Focused Dissemination. Educational Testing Service. Marion Epstein, Elizabeth Margosches, William Schrader, and Wesley Watton. June, 1971. 67 pp.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Laboratory and R&D Center Program

Legislation:

Public Law 531, 83rd Congress, as amended by Title IV, Public Law 89-10

Expiration Date:

Open

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	Indefinite	$ 2,520,000
	1966	"	25,270,000
	1967	"	29,600,000
	1968	"	34,600,000
	1969	"	34,210,000
	1970	"	34,906,000
	1971	"	33,406,000
	1972	"	34,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Institutional Research and Development Programs of the Office of Education have the dual objective of building a network of educational research and development institutions capable of working on the solution of pressing educational problems and of supporting specific research and development efforts within these institutions. The Office of Education presently supports 24 laboratories and centers at an average cost of $1.3 million each per year. The laboratories are non-profit corporations which were established to meet the practical and immediate needs of schools and to respond to both regional and national problems in their program efforts. One of the laboratories also serves as headquarters for the National Program on Early Childhood Education comprised of a consortium of university research centers throughout the country. The R&D Centers were established within the formal structure of universities to conduct research and development activities on selected areas in education at various levels.

The research and development efforts underway in the Laboratories and Centers are designed to create alternaties in five major areas: (1) Research-based instructional systems; (2) Improved planning, management, and evaluation systems; (3) More effective teacher training programs; (4) Strengthened higher education management and more effective programs for disadvantaged post-secondary students; and (5) More effective vocational education.

A new OE policy will divide these 24 institutions into two groups, those which are "mature" and those which are "developing." In the mature institutions OE will support specific programs having fixed termination dates with specified outcomes. In the developing institutions, core support for operating the institution will be provided as well as program support until they too reach maturity.

This Program is scheduled for transfer to the National Institute of Education if established.

Program Effectiveness:

There is no comprehensive evaluation of this Program to date. The results of selected projects, however, suggest the kinds of contributions the Program can make to American education.

Examples of accomplishments of the Educational Laboratories include: (a) The Mini-Course series, now commercially available to schools desiring to help teachers make improvements in basic teaching skills; (b) Individually Prescribed Instruction, a comprehensive curriculum system, now reaching well over 50,000 students in a nation-wide network of 250 elementary schools; (c) Communication Skills Program for teaching reading to kindergarten children, including disadvantaged groups, now reaching 80,000 children and to be used in '72-'73 by 300,000 children. Lab products recently recommended for nation-wide dissemination include a parent/child toy lending library, a bilingual early-childhood program, and a multi-cultural social education program.

Equally important outcomes have resulted from the programs and projects of the Centers. The multi-unit elementary school was an organizational system used in 8 States (164 schools) during 1970-71 and is now ready for wide spread installation. The Wisconsin design for reading skill development helped 22,000 children make 12- to 19-month gains in a 6-month test period. The elementary school evaluation kit, along with instructional techniques to help administrators conduct effective, systematic evaluations of their schools, is now used by 180 districts across the country. The Teaching of Science, a self-directed program to help individualize elementary science teaching, has been validated for preservice training at 12 colleges and for inservice training with over 900 teachers.

The Labs and Centers have been evaluated annually in connection with refunding. This has led to a reduction in the total number of institutions in recent years. On the basis of these evaluations, decisions about continuation funding have concentrated available support in the more promising programs and institutions and stressed completion of high-quality products and maintenance of institutional R&D momentum. Support was withdrawn from laboratories which seemed least likely to develop excellent products.

Two recently completed evaluation studies continue the effort to find ways to improve the internal management and evaluation of the Program. One completed project developed plans for evaluating the current operations of its R&D institutions. This is the basis for a new internal evaluation system which is being readied for installation and which will permit more effective monitoring of Labs and Centers.

A second completed exploratory study of cost factors involved in OE-supported educational research and development indicated that useful data on costs are difficult to obtain because of the differences among cost accounting systems in Labs and Centers. A model data collection system was prepared and a procedure for developing cost factors was offered. The project also led to the establishment of a new effort which will develop a set of guidelines for internal management so that more nearly comparable cost data may be obtained in the future.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Two projects are currently underway. The first, a short-term project, is assessing Lab and Center activities and products in language development and reading across all institutions. It will produce a base line for immediate use in determining future investments in these areas. It will also help verify the new evaluation system being developed for Lab and Center products. (See above.)

The second is developing and will demonstrate a system for evaluating the R&D institutions in terms of the products they have turned out during the past three years. This system will also be sufficiently flexible to permit evaluations of the Lab and Center Program's success in producing materials for a given area, such as reading or arithmetic, and will permit comparisons across areas in order to identify where additional work is needed.

No new evaluation studies are planned for the near future. It is anticipated that if the National Institute of Education is established, such programs will no longer be operated by the Office of Education.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Development and Tryout of an Evaluation System for Ascertaining the Effectiveness of Educational Laboratories and R&D Centers. American Institutes for Research. James Dunn
2. Review of Laboratory & Center Activities and Products in the Areas of Language and Reading. Institute for Educational Development. Henry M. Brickell
3. Design of a Planning and Assessment System for the Division of Manpower and Institutions. Ohio State University Research Foundation. Diane L. Reinhard. August 31, 1971. 9 pp. plus two Advocate Team Reports.

4. Cost Factors for Educational Research and Development: An Exploratory Investigation. Resource Management Corporation. John Phillips and James Scott. September, 1971. 62 pp. (DRAFT)

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Research Training Program

Legislation:

Public Law 89-10, Title IV

Expiration Date:

Open

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	Indefinite	$ 7,400,000
1967	"	6,500,000
1968	"	6,750,000
1969	"	6,750,000
1970	"	6,350,000
1971	"	3,250,000
1972	"	4,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to strengthen the training of specialists who conduct educational research or who develop, evaluate, disseminate and install major improvements in educational practice. Such personnel work in local, State, and Federal education agencies, in higher education institutions, and in public and private research and development organizations.

Under this program, grants and contracts are awarded to improve the training of educational research and development personnel by: (1) Identifying critical personnel and training needs; (2) Developing and demonstrating effective recruitment and training techniques and instructional materials; and (3) Stimulating adoption of the improved training program and/or student support.

Program Effectiveness:

Evaluation funds during the last several years have been used for planning studies to acquire information about both manpower and content needs in research training. Also, a special task force was set up in 1970 to assess the direction of the program in its early years with respect to the results of the analytic studies. These studies indicated that (1) Fellowship support has attracted young people into educational research with academic qualifications equivalent to or exceeding students in other disciplines, (2) Specialized training programs need to be started for new roles in developing, installing, disseminating and evaluating improved educational practices, (3) Instructional materials for new roles in educational R&D should be developed and validated, (4) Training needs to be organized so that more students can learn from direct experience on major R&D projects with outstanding R&D practitioners and instructors. A personnel supply and demand study has projected shortages in the 1970's, especially in State and local educational agencies, that can be met at a reasonable cost only by expanding and improving inservice training and by upgrading foundation courses in educational R&D at institutions which already attract large numbers of highly able graduate students.

The Research Training Program was changed substantially in 1971 as a result of these studies and reviews. A new program strategy was implemented which stressed development and demonstration of training techniques and materials that can be adopted in many institutions wishing to improve their training capability. The new strategy was initiated through projects in three consortia composed of educational R&D organizations, universities, school systems, and State educational agencies and through complementary projects at non-consortium institutions. Specialized programs were demonstrated for: (1) Meeting inservice and preservice training needs of R&D personnel in member institutions of the consortia, (2) Recruiting and training minority personnel, (3) Orienting unemployed aerospace personnel to educational R&D, and (4) Training new types of paraprofessional and support personnel to relieve senior staff of less complex but time-consuming activities.

Graduate and post-doctoral programs supported since 1966 are being converted to self-support by the end of 1973. Support was continued during FY 1971 for 420 graduate trainees who entered programs in 1970, but no new fellowships were awarded.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No evaluation studies are currently underway or planned for the near future. It is anticipated that if the National Institute of Education is established, the great share of such program activities will be transferred to the new agency.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Development of Procedures for Upgrading Training of Educational Research Personnel. American Educational Research Association. Blaine Worthen.
2. Study of Research and Research-Related Personnel in Education and Procedures for Facilitating and Improving the Training of Such Personnel. American Educational Research Association. Blaine Worthen.
3. Generation of Information to Support Long-Term Manpower Studies of and Planning for Training Programs in Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Evaluation. Teaching Research, Oregon State System of Higher Education. H. Del Shalock.

4. Review of Research Related to Training for Research in Education.
Robert Bargar & Corhann Okorodudu, authors.
Ohio State University Research Foundation, Columbus.
1967. 211 pp. Paper-board cover.

> Reviews studies of research training in other fields as well as specific training in education. Variables such as student background, student selection, faculty recruitment, institutional setting are discussed.

5. A Study of Factors Relevant to the Development of Applied Educational Research Training Programs
Bound dissertation.
Bernard J. Fleury, Jr., author
Submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Massachusetts, April, 1968. 231 pp. Spring-binder.

> Evaluation of USOE (Title IV) training programs in general and U. of Mass. Training Program in particular. Data from questionnaires include: academic background, age, grade-point average of research trainees as well as course content, practicum experiences, and program requirements of training program. Includes recommendations and outline of model program for U. of Mass.

6. Report on Educational Research, Development, and Diffusion Manpower, 1964-1974
David L. Clark & John E. Hopkins, authors
Indiana University Research Foundation (Bloomington), 1969.
579 pp. Soft cover.

> Makes qualitative and quantitative analyses of personnel in educational R, D, & D in 1964: roles, institutional settings, training, funding, functions. Gives projections of demands for personnel in 1974 and analyses of current training programs and sources of supply. Discusses Title IV ESEA research training programs. Makes recommendations for increasing manpower supply.

January, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Experimental Schools Program

Legislation:

Public Law 89-10, Title IV

Expiration Date:

Open

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1971	Indefinite	$ 12,000,000
1972	"	15,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the Experimental Schools Program is to test comprehensive alternatives to present educational practices, procedures, and performance. By supporting a limited number of large-scale, comprehensive experiments with a major focus on documentation and evaluation, Experimental Schools will attempt to serve as a bridge from research, demonstration, and experimentation to actual educational practice.

During FY 1971 this program initiated three Experimental Schools projects which involved over 11,000 students, of whom 65 percent were from low-income families. The projects each represent the combination of a diversity of promising practices derived from research, demonstration, and experimentation in a comprehensive educational program. Among these practices are at least a dozen which have been developed under projects supported through the OE extra-mural R&D program.

The three sites are in Berkeley, California; Pierce County, Washington; and Minneapolis, Minnesota. In addition, 11 sites have been awarded planning grants for the further development of projects designed to be comprehensive alternatives to current school structures, practices, and performance. Five of these will be operational in September 1972. Also, 5 more sites were given short-term grants designed to assist in the development and testing of particularly important and innovative ideas which could be included in the development of comprehensive programs.

Program Effectiveness:

Project evaluation and documentation will consume from 15 percent to 40 percent of the funds. Formal evaluation of the individual projects will not be completed until the end of the 5-year span of each project. In FY 71 an evaluation and documentation study was started for each of the three projects which became operational. A separate, independent evaluation team is now operating at each site. Similar evaluation studies will be initiated for each new Experimental School project. In addition, at least one study will cut across all projects to get at generalizations and compare outcomes.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The evaluation studies mentioned above and listed below are currently underway. Future studies will be commenced as part of each new project.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Formal Evaluation Studies Documentation & Evaluation of Experimental Programs in Schools. Scientific Analysis Corp. Leonard J. Duhl.
2. Evaluation & Documentation of Franklin Pierce School District Experimental Schools Project. Northwest Regional Education Laboratory. Paul Killian.
3. Minneapolis Evaluation Team. ARIES Corporation. Gaylord Milbrandt.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS AND EFFECTIVENESS INFORMATION

H. EDUCATIONAL DISSEMINATION

Page
1. Spread of Exemplary Practices 277
2. Strengthening State and Local Dissemination Capabilities. . . . 279
3. Educational Resources Information Centers 281
4. Interpretive Summaries 283
5. General Program Dissemination: Office of Public Affairs . . . 285

January 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Spread of Exemplary Practices

Legislation:

Cooperative Research Act
P. L. 83-531

Expiration Date:

None

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1971	Indefinite	$2,200,000
1972	Indefinite	2,200,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of this program is to accelerate the spread and installation of validated practices and research-based products. This is a developmental/demonstration program directed at the needs of local school districts for information about, and support for, trying out and adopting successful innovations. The program provides project grants to identify and verify the effectiveness of research-based products and school-developed programs; to bring information about these programs to local educators and organizations that serve local educators; to operate visitation and observation services at sites of selected exemplary programs; to provide follow up consultation to schools interested in adopting programs; and to accelerate nationwide use of selected major R&D based instructional systems by arranging for their use in geographically scattered settings.

Program Effectiveness:

The program began in FY 1971, but many of the specific activities did not start until the beginning of the 1971-72 school year. Consequently, no formal evaluation data is available at this time. However, general estimates indicate that 700,000 educators were affected by the program during FY 1971. This is based on sizes of mailings and estimated attendances at conferences and displays.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Three evaluation projects were begun in FY 1971 to track three initial efforts to spread successful programs. One project is following the impact of the effort designed to encourage use of alternative successful reading programs. Another is evaluating the impact of a traveling display which presents information about 10 major research-based instructional approaches and teaching methods. A third evaluates the success of the installation of the Multi-unit staffing and instructional model in 250 schools. Data will be available from these studies in summer, 1972.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Investigation of Communication Efforts and their Relation to Stages of Adoption of Selected Reading Programs 7/1/71 - 12/31/72.
2. Evaluation of Communication Exposure and Subsequent Action with Respect to Educational Innovations in 10 Display Modules of Educational Products - 7/1/71 - 6/30/72.
3. Evaluation of the Nation-wide Installation of the Multi-unit School Project - 8/1/71 - 8/31/72.
4. Output measures maintained by NCEC.

January 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Strengthening State and Local Dissemination Capabilities.

Legislation:

Cooperative Research Act
P.L. 83-531, as amended

Expiration Date:

None

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1970	Indefinite	$ 400,000
1971	"	650,000
1972	"	650,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of this program is to strengthen the capabilities of State and local education agencies to acquire, disseminate, and apply results of research and successful innovation programs. This is a developmental/demonstration program directed at the needs of local educators for information which may be used to solve educational problems. The program awards grants and contracts to State and local agencies for the planning and operation of educational resource centers. Staff from State and local centers help the educator specify his problem, aid him in locating available information from the entire Nation, and carry through by securing additional help, when necessary, for the application of the information.

The program began FY 1970 with awards for initial State Pilot Dissemination Programs in three States. An additional five State pilot centers were added in FY 1971, along with five local sites.

Program Effectiveness:

An initial evaluation of the operation of the initial three State centers by Columbia University is near completion. Interim results are available from this study. Records maintained by the States also provide evaluation data. Evidence, based on the first year of operation, supports the validity of combining an information retrieval service at the State agency level with local field agents, who live in local districts and provide services to educators in that district and adjacent districts. Records show that the three States, in their first year, provided over 2,000 information packages in reply to requests for information from superintendents, teachers, and State agency specialists. Approximately 700 of these educators received personalized assistance from field agents in formulating their problems, interpreting the information provided, and in applying the information obtained. In addition to improvements in the teaching skills of individual teachers, over 20 districts made decisions to adapt or adopt new practices which they learned about through the services of the State model programs. Just as important are the premature or ill-advised decisions that were averted by timely retrieval of up-to-date information.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Evaluation of the three pilot State efforts will continue in FY 1972. Evaluation of the FY 1971 sites also will commence. The data will be utilized in conjunction with the planning and operation of additional State centers and new local centers. It will be especially helpful in the conceptualization of the new "educational extension agent" component of the new educational renewal sites.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Evaluation of Pilot State Dissemination Programs - 9/29/70 - 12/29/71

2. Records maintained by the States.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Resources Information Centers

Legislation: Expiration Date:

Cooperative Research Act
P.L. 83-531, as amended

None

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1966	Indefinite	$1,200,000
	1967	"	2,415,000
	1968	"	2,400,000
	1969	"	4,045,000
	1970	"	5,200,000
	1971	"	4,000,000
	1972	"	4,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of the Educational Resources Information Centers (ERIC) is to provide ready access to research, development, and evaluation reports, descriptions of exemplary programs, and current journal literature. Through a network of specialized clearinghouses and for-profit contractors, current significant reports relevant to education are acquired, evaluated, abstracted, indexed, and announced in ERIC reference journals. Full copies of desired documents are made available in micro-form (microfiche) or pamphlet form (hard copy). Contracts are awarded for the operation of all ERIC components. This is a service program which meets the needs of educators for current information in all fields of education.

Program Effectiveness:

No comprehensive evaluation of the operation and impact of this program has been undertaken in earlier years. Four formal studies have now commenced (see section on ongoing studies below). In the meantime, informal evaluation of ERIC has been conducted by OE staff as well as ERIC's customers continuously since its inception in 1966. The continuous growth in sales and use of ERIC products attest to their value. A number of indicators such as sale of reports, number of organizations buying all ERIC microfiche, number of requests for help from clearinghouses, and reports from college and university libraries and State and local information centers, provide further evidence of the utility of these services and products.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

In FY 1971 the Office of Education initiated four formal evaluation studies on critical aspects of the ERIC program: an evaluation of ERIC products and services; an assessment of the quality and utility of ERIC clearinghouse products plus other NCEC products; a study to develop and analyze alternative ERIC clearinghouse structures; and a study to define and categorize the user community, to analyze the present structure and composition of the ERIC files, and to offer cost-beneficial strategies for organizing the files for easier practitioner use. Data from the first study will be available in early 1972. Data will be available from the other studies by summer 1972.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Evaluation Study of ERIC Services and Products
   4/1/70 - 12/31/71.
2. An Evaluation of NCEC Information Analysis Products
   7/1/71 - 3/31/72
3. An Analysis of the ERIC Systems
   6/30/71 - 11/30/71
4. The ERIC File Partition Study
   6/29/71 - 6/29/72
5. Growth and Use Data compiled by NCEC

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Interpretive Summaries

Legislation:

Cooperative Research Act
P. L. 83-531, as amended

Expiration Date:

None

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1971	Indefinite	$ 600,000
1972	"	600,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of this program is to disseminate interpretive summaries of current knowledge for use by educators. This program is a service program directed at the needs of busy teachers, administrators and school board members for summaries of current knowledge. Project grants or contracts are awarded for the preparation of interpretations of knowledge on topics of national concern. The contractor is required not only to analyze and interpret reports of research and current practice, but also to include representatives of the intended users as advisors or as a test group to assure the relevance of his report to their needs. The resulting interpretive summaries have mainly been disseminated as monthly reports under the PREP series (Putting Research into Educational Practice). Other dissemination forms include reports written for teachers, administrators, or other specialists for audiovisual presentation and leadership training conferences.

Program Effectiveness:

No overall evaluation of the general impact of this program on educational decision-making has been undertaken. Experience indicates, however, that there is an interested clientele for the program product. For instance, PREP reports have been enthusiasticly received by State dissemination centers. State agencies have reproduced and disseminated over 200,000 copies of PREP reports and ERIC clearinghouse publications with no additional support.

Formal studies to identify user needs, which are essential to program operation, have been undertaken. One such study, conducted in FY 1969, identified priority areas that were used as topics for some of the early interpretive summaries.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

A study was begun to update the previous user needs study as well as to design instruments and procedures which may be used to collect similar information on a periodic basis (probably biannual). Also in FY 1971, a project was initiated to evaluate the quality of PREP reports and other ERIC publications. Data from these current studies will be available in the spring and summer of 1972.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Innovative Problems and Information Needs of Educational Practitioners 6/25/69 - 3/25/70.
2. Developing a Sensing Network for Information Needs in Education 6/25/71 - 6/24/72.
3. An Evaluation of NCEC Information Analysis Products 7/1/71 - 3/31/72.
4. Informal Survey of State Departments on Use of PREP

AN ANNUAL EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program Name:

General Program Dissemination: Office of Public Affairs

Legislation:

General Education Provisions Act,
Section 412

Expiration Date:

None

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1970	Indefinite	$1,600,000
1971	"	500,000
1972	"	400,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of General Program Dissemination is to make information available to the widest possible audience -- including the general population as well as professional educators -- about programs deriving from Office of Education supported research and practices. The funds are expended primarily through contracts for performing public information functions by means of various mass media and through meetings, conferences, or workshops. The purpose of these activities is to foster awareness of OE programs and to encourage individuals to take an active role in improving education in their communities. General Program Dissemination activities have been underway since FY 1970. Examples of the types of projects funded are a travelling seminar on reading, radio and TV spots, a film on early childhood education and the Lifetime Learning Survey.

Program Effectiveness:

No formal evaluation of the impact of this program on public awareness and attitudes has been undertaken. Available program statistics, however, measure the public contact of some of the products coming out of FY 70 funded projects. For example, as of October 31, 1971, after three months of distributing the film, "The Right to Read," the film was shown 160 times on television, to 5,790,100 estimated viewers, at a time value of $13,938. Theatrical bookings for the same time period totaled 939 bookings and 2,180 showings to about 79,225 people. Radio and Television spot commercials will be distributed beginning in January 1972 in the same way. Approximately 2400 persons in eight cities across the nation participated in a series of "Seminars on Reading in the Seventies" staged by OPA through a contract during 1971. A film was made of one of the Seminars, and that, along with the film "The Right to Read" and the radio and television spots in support of the Right to Read Effort will be part of a public information campaign to involve Americans in making the Right to Read a reality during the seventies.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Evaluation is built into each individual project. Most of the FY 1970 and 1971 projects are either still in progress or are too recently completed for evaluation to have been completed.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Informal "inhouse" assessments

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS AND EFFECTIVENESS INFORMATION

I. NATIONAL PRIORITY PROGRAMS

Page

1. Right-to-Read. 288
2. Drug Abuse Education 291
3. Environmental Education 293
4. Nutrition and Health 295

January 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Right-to-Read

Legislation:

Varied[1]

Expiration Date:

None

Funding History:

	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
FY	1971	Indefinite	$ 2,000,000
	1972	Indefinite	12,000,000[2]

Program Purpose and Operation:

The long-range goal of the Right-to-Read Program is to increase substantially functional literacy in this country. The ability to read is essential for one to function effectively as an adult in our society. Yet, more than three million adults in the United States are illiterate and approximately 18½ million cannot read well enough to complete simple tasks required for common living needs. Approximately 7 million public school children require special instruction in reading. Even after they have completed high school, one-third to one-half of the new students in junior colleges need some type of reading help.

Through the demonstration of effective and efficient reading programs and the provision of technical assistance, the objective of Right-to-Read is to help all reading programs to become effective, regardless of the source of funding, the level of instruction or the age of the participant. This program hopes to influence Federal formula grant and discretionary funds as well as State and local funds, and will involve experimental, demonstration, service and support activities. It will also be responsible for awarding a limited number of grants and contracts.

1/ Projects are funded from the following sources:

1. Title III, ESEA, 1965, as amended
2. Title VII, ESEA, 1965
3. Adult Basic Education Act, 1966
4. Title IV, Higher Education Act, 1965
5. Education Professions Development Act, Part E
6. Education Professions Development Act, Part D
7. General Education Provisions Act, Sec. 402
8. General Education Provisions Act, Sec. 412

2/ Includes $1.75 million funding for the National Reading Council, to develop support for the Right-to-Read effort in the private sector.

FY 71 was a planning and data collection year for the program. A master plan for the total Right-to-Read effort was developed, and the National Reading Council was appointed to stimulate the involvement of private groups. In FY 72, Right-to-Read plans include support of up to 120 projects, both school-based and community-based. Of these projects, approximately 70% of the funds are estimated to benefit the poor.

The total FY 72 plans include: (1) 24 Redirection programs in which Right-to-Read identifies ineffective Federally funded reading programs and attempts, through technical assistance and limited grants, to foster redirection and improvement; (2) 13 Transition programs in which Right-to-Read provides assistance to schools without substantial Federal funds which are willing to make the transition from ineffective programs to effective programs; and (3) 18 Expansion programs for schools in which promising practices are occurring and Right-to-Read is extending such practices into demonstration programs. In addition, 23 large cities and 5 States will receive grants to develop Right-to-Read strategies for improving reading throughout their areas. Community-based projects will be funded to provide reading instruction for those people who are out of school.

Program Effectiveness:

Because of the recent initiation of Right-to-Read projects, there has not been any large scale evaluation of the impact of projects. However, the National Achievement Study funded by USOE has provided base line data on the reading achievement of 9 year olds, 13 year olds, 17 year olds, and young adults (ages 26-35).

Other additions to the data base include a literature search which determined the extent and distribution of the national reading problem by identifying, analyzing and summarizing existing survey and test data, determining the frequency of use for various instructional methods, approaches and materials, and describing the nature and extent of current practices in the training of those who teach reading.

A major conclusion of the review was that a better definition of literacy is needed to replace the variety of definitions now in place. The study also recommended that further efforts be directed to the economic consequences of reading, particularly in the adult population; for example, much more needs to be known about the reading requirements of jobs, especially those jobs which could be filled by the currently unemployed and underemployed.

Progress toward a new standard of literacy will be aided by the Texas State Education Agency, which is developing adult performance-level criteria to replace the "years of schooling" yardstick commonly used in determining literacy. With a grant from USOE, this project will also assist in the production of appropriate curriculum materials to aid the national Right-to-Read effort. Results from these various studies will provide valuable management information for the Right-to-Read program.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are two major evaluation activities planned for FY 72. One project will develop procedures for continuous monitoring of Right-to-Read programs; this system will provide Office of Education staff with descriptive data on program operation and ongoing effectiveness. A second evaluation project will compare a selected group of elementary level Right-to-Read programs with other Federally supported and non-Federally supported reading programs. Both evaluation projects will provide data on the extent of reading achievement gain in Right-to-Read sites.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. National Achievement Study; periodic testing of reading achievement.
2. The Information Base for Reading; 1971.
3. Adult Level Performance Project; begun September 1971.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Drug Abuse Education

Legislation:

Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970

Expiration Date:

1973

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
FY	1971	$10,000,000	$ 6,000,000
	1972	20,000,000	13,024,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the Drug Abuse Education Program is to help schools and communities assess and respond to their drug abuse problems by becoming aware of the nature of the problem and developing strategies aimed at its causes rather than merely responding to its symptoms. The program strongly encourages a coordinated community effort.

The basic strategy is to develop leadership teams at both the State and local levels through a variety of training programs and to give technical assistance to programs developed by such teams as specific needs are identified.

Funds for training are primarily allocated in project grants to State Education Departments, pilot college and community programs, and a network of training programs. Through the National Action Committee for Drug Education, technical assistance is provided to programs at every level.

Program Effectiveness:

Current evaluative data consists of program operation statistics and some preliminary impact data. For instance, as of June 30, 1971, over 400,000 individuals have been trained. These include personnel from State, county and local agencies, community representatives, youth, and educational personnel at all levels. Training programs varied from one day to several weeks in duration. In FY 71, OE supported 28 community-based projects, 19 college based projects, and 11 Title III projects which combined school-community efforts.

As part of an interim evaluation sponsored by the National Action Committee for Drug Education, surveys were conducted to assess the impact of training on a sample of trainees. Responses indicated an increased awareness and understanding of drug problems, increased ability to communicate with young people and with individuals from different disciplines on the part of trainees. Participants also felt that skills developed in the drug area were useful in responding to other types of youth problems.

Case histories were also developed for a sample of seven States' Drug Education programs. Results based on this small sample suggest that the training has stimulated interagency cooperation at the State and local level; youth involvement in planning and programs has increased and has contributed to more effective communication between youth and adults; there has been a favorable impact on school-community relations; individuals from a variety of disciplines and life styles have been brought together and increased tolerance for diversity of viewpoint has been developed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Drug Education Program is included in the evaluation of all Health, Education, and Welfare drug education and information programs. This study is evaluating the validity and sophistication of education programs and materials. It will conduct a survey of drug abuse education transmitters and target audience groups in six communities which have been selected to include Office of Education projects.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. The Drug Abuse Information/Education Program Evaluation (DHEW); in progress
2. Training for "People" Problems: An Assessment of Federal Program Management Strategies for Training Teachers to Deal with Drug Education; 1971.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Environmental Education

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Environmental Education Act of 1970	1973

Funding History:		Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	FY	1971	$ 5,000,000	$ 2,000,000
		1972	15,000,000	3,514,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The goal of environmental education is to establish both formal and non-formal educational programs directed to all segments of the population to develop an informed public that: 1) will understand mutual dependencies between man and his human and physical environment; and 2) will assume responsibility for the quality of the environment. The program also provides an opportunity to help redirect American education by encouraging curriculum integration around environmental topics and issues.

The primary strategies used are the coordination of national goals for environmental education, development of plans for the accomplishment of these goals, monitoring of the state of the art, encouraging other Federal agencies to participate in the plan, and supplementing the activities of other agencies with project grants.

Grant awards made to State and local groups support demonstration projects in: community education, curriculum development, planning, and training of educational and non-educational personnel. technical assistance is also provide to regional, State and local organizations.

Program Effectiveness:

No comprehensive evaluation of the impact of this program on public awareness and attitudes about environmental matters has yet been undertaken. Program statistics, however, indicate the current operational scope and reach.

For instance, in FY 1971 Environmental Education supported 74 projects reaching directly or indirectly an estimated 48 million persons throughout the country. The distribution of projects, by primary purpose, was as follows:

Community education	29 projects
State-wide development of priorities	5

General resources development; including evaluation and dissemination	16
Personnel training	7
Formal school projects; including curriculum	17

A considerable amount of effort has gone into the development of a management data base, the completion of a survey of resources for environmental education in all 50 States. Building upon State catalogs which were developed for the project, the survey includes comprehensive listings of programs, resource people, and relevant pieces of legislation. The Office of Education has also developed a descriptive listing of all USOE funded environmental education programs throughout the country, and a similar listing of all EE programs supported by other Federal agencies.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation of the impact of environmental education projects on participants' attitudes and knowledge is tentatively planned for the next year.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Survey of State Resources for Environmental Education; 1971.

2. Descriptive List of USOE-Funded Programs in Environmental Education; 1971.

3. Descriptive List of Environmental Education Programs Supported by Other Federal Agencies; 1971.

January 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Nutrition and Health

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, Section 808	1973

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
FY	1971	Indefinite	$2,000,000
	1972	Indefinite	2,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the program is to demonstrate ways through which the gap between needs and delivery of nutrition and health services can be narrowed by coordinating, focusing, and utilizing existing health and educational resources at the local level. Federal programs involved are HEW Children and Youth Projects, HEW Comprehensive Health Centers, NIMH Community Mental Health Centers, as well as OEO and Model Cities programs.

Program Effectiveness:

The projects have been in operation for only a short time. Consequently, there has not yet been a detailed or useful evaluation.

In FY 71, the first eight demonstration projects were funded, reaching 10,600 children in 24 schools. These projects are continuing, while three new projects are added during FY 72. The total demonstration effort will eventually consist of 20 projects of three years each, reaching 26,000 children in 60 schools throughout the country. The final wave of projects will be phased out in FY 1975.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation design now being developed will allow for continual testing and monitoring of such variables as existing patterns of interagency coordination, service delivery systems, type and scope of resources available. An individual evaluation is also part of each project. Interim reports will be available at the end of the projects' first and second years; in-depth evaluation results will become available as the first eight projects are completed in 1973.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

First interim report on the progress of the eight projects funded in FY 71.